



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1998

No. 2

House of Representatives

The House met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM NUSSLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Paul I. Nussle, Executive Director, Exodus Housing, Sumner, Washington, offered the following prayer:

To everything there is a season. Turn, turn, turn. This is a time for every noble purpose under heaven.

Gracious and Mighty God, as we assemble in this Chamber rich with a tradition of freedom and steeped in sacred liberty, grant us clarity to see Your presence this day, and courage to place firm reliance on Your living Word!

Still the voices of clamor and turmoil that bring division; counsel us in seeking mercy when overzealousness for justice would tear the fabric of steadfast love and grace.

This is the Season and this is the Time when we would again take firm hold of the words carved in the podium before us; a rudder for our course!

Peace, liberty, tolerance, justice, union. This is the season and this is the time, refreshed from recess, letting go of sorrows and yearnings unattained, we come with eagerness to pursue noble ambition.

Lord, may Your benediction of peace and mercy keep us from hypocrisy this day and always. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KLECZKA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of both Houses.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to a resolution of the following title:

S. Res. 165. *Resolved*, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

RENAMING WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought we had heard it all, now the effort to rename Washington's National Airport after one of our Nation's most respected leaders in the

20th century has met with opposition that is purely partisan in nature. Opposing the effort to pay tribute to President Ronald Reagan is just the latest example of "oh, you are for it? Well, we are against it now" politics employed by my liberal colleagues.

I understand that the diversity of opinion in this House are often vital when setting policies of this Nation. A healthy debate is an absolute must if we are to reach sound conclusions on important and vital national issues. However, I feel it is an absolute disservice to a great man that petty, partisan politics threatens to stain his great legacy.

This is clearly no place for partisan politics. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2625, a bill to rename Washington's National Airport after former President Ronald Reagan.

MEDICARE PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION ACT

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Medicare Preservation and Restoration Act in response to the concerns of many seniors in my district and around the country about the recent changes of the Medicare program.

As my colleagues know, the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997 contains the Kyl amendment, which permits private contracting between doctors and Medicare beneficiaries for medical services that otherwise would be covered under the Medicare program.

Know full well that private contracts will increase medical expenses for America's seniors and substantially weaken the integrity of the program. Beneficiaries who establish private

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H67

contracts with physicians are obligated to pay 100 percent of the bill out of their own pocket. By circumventing the Medicare system, private contracts will create a two-tiered health care system where the elderly of modest means are forced to receive second rate care or bankrupt themselves to pay high prices under private contracts.

Repealing the Kyl amendment and placing an outright prohibition on any private contracts for services currently covered in the Medicare program is the only way to guarantee seniors access to affordable medical care now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to review this legislation and join me in restoring the commitment that Medicare made to senior citizens more than 30 years ago.

The Medicare Preservation and Restoration Act will repeal the Medicare private contracting provision of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and clarify that private contracts are prohibited under Medicare for Medicare covered services.

The legislation I am introducing is simple. First, it requires that providers submit a Medicare claim whenever Medicare-covered services are provided to a beneficiary. Second, it requires that a provider, when treating a Medicare beneficiary, charge no more than Medicare's balance billing limits allow. My legislation will settle the issue of private contracting once and for all. It will explicitly prohibit providers from circumventing the Medicare system, it will preserve beneficiary billing protections, and it will restore the promise of quality and affordable health care for every American senior citizen. My legislation has the support and endorsement of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare and the National Council of Senior Citizens. The Medicare Rights Center also has spoken out in opposition to Medicare private contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the only way we can continue to guarantee every senior citizen in America the right to affordable health care under Medicare. The private contracts allowed under the Balanced Budget Act represent a dangerous first-step towards dismantling the Medicare program as a whole. They are ill-conceived and unnecessary. These contracts will allow doctors to disregard Medicare's most important protection—balanced billing limits. These limits guarantee that all seniors regardless of their income or their health status will have access to affordable health care. Private contracts destroy these protections and allow doctors the ability to decide patient-by-patient which senior will be forced to pay more than Medicare's set rates for needed medical care.

During debate on the budget bill last October, Senator JOHN KYL of Arizona included this private contracting provision to allow any doctor to treat Medicare patients outside of the program and bill the patient privately at any rate the doctor sets. During negotiations on the final package, the provision was altered to protect beneficiaries and to prevent physicians from moving back and forth between billing some patients privately and others through the Medicare program. The final bill stated that if the doctor wanted to treat seniors under private contract, then the doctor had to forgo Medicare participation entirely for two years.

This two-year restriction was designed to protect the program against fraud, guard against a massive exit of physicians from the Medicare program, and ensure that doctors would not create a two-tiered Medicare system—one waiting room for private pay patients who are served first, and one for non-private Medicare beneficiaries who are served last. Now, a movement is underway to remove this two-year limitation and give doctors the right to decide not only patient-by-patient, but procedure-by-procedure, which services will be billed through Medicare and which will be billed privately.

Many of you have probably seen the mailings certain interest groups have been sending to our senior constituents in an attempt to distort the facts about private contracts. These mailings are falsely scaring seniors and attempting to trick seniors into giving up Medicare's balanced billing protections.

These groups are not telling the truth when they say that Medicare won't pay for seniors' health care. They are not telling the truth when they say that seniors are going to be left with no doctors that will treat Medicare beneficiaries. The truth is virtually any doctor anywhere in the country today will treat a Medicare beneficiary. Currently, fewer than five percent of doctors decline to participate in Medicare, and of all the doctors' bills submitted to the Medicare program, over 90 percent are paid at a fixed rate set by the program.

These groups are not telling the truth when they say that if Medicare won't pay for a senior's health or medical needs then that senior will have to go without treatment. The truth is seniors have always been able to purchase medical care that Medicare does not pay for by paying for the service out of their own pocket. This has always been the case and has not changed.

These groups are not telling the truth when they say that private contracting will increase options for seniors. The truth is the only thing that private contracts will increase is seniors' health care costs. Unless we repeal this private contract provision and restore Medicare balanced billing limits, seniors will be forced to negotiate with their doctor on their own for needed medical care. Unless we eliminate private contracts, seniors will be forced to pay out of their own pockets for medical care at whatever rate the doctor decides to charge.

Let's restore Medicare's balanced billing limits for all Medicare beneficiaries by eliminating these dangerous private contracts. These billing limits are the only way we can guarantee that all seniors receive the health care they need at reasonable and fair prices.

I urge my colleagues to strip away the rhetoric and conjecture, to examine this issue closely and in its entirety. And, I believe you will come to the same conclusion that I have that private contracts are unnecessary and have the potential to destroy the Medicare program. I urge you to cosponsor the Medicare Preservation and Restoration Act—a sensible and responsible solution which will guarantee Medicare for all elderly Americans.

HONORING U.S. SERVICE MEMBERS KILLED AND INJURED DURING VIETNAMESE TET OFFENSIVE

(Mr. RYUN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this week, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong launched what is now known as the Tet Offensive. During the Vietnam War a cease-fire was traditionally observed during the Vietnamese holiday, Tet. Both sides of the Vietnam War agreed to a cease-fire to extend from January 27 to February 2, 1968. However, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong broke their agreement and launched a massive attack during this week. The Viet Cong assault team began the attack by breaching the walls of the United States Embassy in Saigon. The entire attack lasted 2 weeks and took 1,000 American soldiers' lives.

I have introduced a resolution honoring the Members of the United States Armed Forces who either fought or were killed during the Tet Offensive and the families of the service members who were killed or injured during that fighting. I ask my colleagues to join in honoring our service members who died 30 years ago during this offensive.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR HEALTH CARE INITIATIVES

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last night the President outlined his agenda for Americans. Democrats and Republicans should strive to work together and implement his ideas on issues such as enacting a true consumer Bill of Rights to guarantee choice, access and quality health care in HMOs and enabling the near elderly to buy into the Medicare program. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is already putting special interests ahead of the American public by supporting million-dollar ad campaigns to fight these new health care initiatives.

Numerous constituents have contacted me with their concerns about managed care. Congress needs to pass a ground floor of quality assurance standards for managed care organizations, and Democrats will also fight to enact the President's Medicare buy-in proposal that would grant access to the Medicare program for those aged 62 to 65 and those over 55 who are laid off or displaced. This initiative will not cost the Medicare program or raise the deficit. Instead, it will provide access to the best health care program in the world for these near elderly.

I just want to say, we should support these initiatives on a bipartisan basis.

SUPER BOWL XXXII

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, they said it could not be done. Thirty-eight years as a team without winning the big one, and they said it could not be done. For

13 years the National Football Conference dominated the American Conference in the Super Bowl and they said the American Football Conference could not do it. Four previous times the thundering herd from the Mile High City had charged up to the summit only to come down with a thud, and some said it could not be done. When they lost the last three games of the season, many said they were finished, another year of disappointment. Again, it could not be done. Wild card teams do not get to the big game, they sure do not win it.

Well, the experts said they cannot do it. But I say to my colleagues, these that said it could not be done were wrong. They did it. The Broncos are world champions. I guess it could be done after all.

IRS REFORM

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS has finally confessed. A spokesman admitted, and I quote: "IRS seizure practices are unfair." He further said that the IRS is now starting a new program. Check this out: Under this new program, the IRS district director must approve all seizures. Unbelievable. The IRS district director is now the sole judge, jury and executioner of our property. Beam me up. I now know why the IRS actually could look in the mirror and believe they are consumer friendly.

Mr. Speaker, they believe all taxpayers are nothing more than a bunch of masochists. Support my legislation that will require judicial consent and approval before the IRS can grab our assets. I yield back the balance of any money we have left.

STYLE VERSUS SUBSTANCE

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, last night the President gave a great speech, but the issue is not the style of the speech, it is the substance of what the President said.

Two years ago the President said in the State of the Union speech, the era of big government is over, but last night the President outlined new programs that will cost us \$40 billion in new spending each year. That is completely different from what he has said in the past. It is clear the President is for bigger government and higher deficits, while we here in the House have successfully worked for smaller government and lower taxes.

Now, there are many areas that we can work together on: Reforming education, saving Social Security and Medicare, fighting crime and drug abuse, reforming the IRS, and we can

do all of these things without breaking our pledge to balance the Federal budget and reduce our Federal debt. But the new Federal programs with greater bureaucracy and more spending will take us off the mark of a balanced Federal budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can work together to our common goals that we can reach.

BOLD AGENDA FOR 1998

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are back and ready to work. Last night the President laid out a bold agenda for the coming year. I might remind my colleagues this is the first President since 1969 to appear before a joint session of this House and come here with a balanced budget, and within that balanced budget talked about issues, things that we need to work on that in fact can help working middle class families in this country. Expand Medicare, allow health care coverage for those who are near retirement who might need it and might not be able to get it. They pay into it. Ensure high quality health care with a consumer Bill of Rights. Reform managed care, making quality child care more accessible and affordable, raise the minimum wage, and yes, preserve Social Security.

What does the Republican leadership have on their legislative agenda? Nothing. What important votes are they going to take to help the lives of middle class families? None. They are sending us home for the next two or three weeks. What is the Republican leadership going to give the American public? Nothing, zero, zip.

Mr. Speaker, let us get engaged in the President's bold agenda.

ACHIEVING AMERICA'S GOALS

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, last night in the State of the Union message the President set some good goals for America. He talked about a balanced budget, he talked about saving Social Security. He committed himself further to welfare reform; he is for education reform, he is against drugs, he is even for some family tax cuts.

The question is not about whether these are the goals we want for America, but how to achieve those goals.

□ 1315

For instance, the President said that a family of four that makes less than \$35,000 should not pay any Federal income tax if they have high child care costs. Well, I agree. A family of four that makes less than \$35,000 should not pay any Federal income tax. But it

should not matter whether they have child care costs or not—\$35,000 for a family of four is \$35,000.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to work for those American families, and we ought to work for better solutions for American families.

LET US PUT SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST

(Mr. ROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the problems that faced America 2 weeks ago are still the same problems that we face today. Despite what has occurred in the last week, Congress still has the obligation to move the country forward.

Last year, in a remarkable show of bipartisan effort, the Congress gave back to Americans \$94 billion in tax cuts and education benefits. Now that we have balanced the budget and given America its well-deserved tax cut, we must take care of today's seniors and the seniors of tomorrow by saving Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow seniors who have put into the system for their whole lives to fall into poverty just because they decided to retire; and we must never ask them to choose between food, health care, and their home. They deserve security and dignity. They paid for it.

So let us join together across party lines, as we did for the balanced budget and for the tax cuts, by heeding President Clinton's call. Let us put Social Security first.

IT IS A NEW YEAR AND A GOOD TIME TO CUT TAXES

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we not let any distraction going on here in Washington get in the way of our responsibility to provide tax reduction and tax reform to the American people. With Federal taxes now approaching 20 percent of the Gross National Product, the highest peacetime figure in American history, and a runaway tax collecting bureaucracy that strikes fear in the hearts of every hard-working taxpayer, this Congress, notwithstanding the usual White House roadblocks, must move forward with tax cuts, tax simplification and tax fairness now. If the President chooses to oppose our efforts, let him explain his opposition to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of things have changed for the better since fiscal conservatives replaced tax-and-spend liberals in the House majority here in Washington: welfare finally reformed, a balanced budget actually in sight, family tax relief on the way. But more relief is due the American people. We need to move with dispatch. The American taxpayers deserve no less.

WHAT AMERICAN FAMILIES NEED

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last night the President laid out a blueprint that addresses the needs of America's family in his strong State of the Union address. He laid out a blueprint to start protecting Social Security and make sure that it is on financial safe footing in the 21st century.

He laid out a plan for managed care reform that for the first time will make sure that those individuals who are receiving medical care through managed care are, in fact, getting the medical care that they need and that they deserve, given their ailments and not that which is decided by bookkeepers and CEOs and shareholders who have nothing to do with the delivery of medical care, those very same people who are overriding the judgment of doctors who ask that their patients be taken care of in one manner and the managed care organizations decide that they will not do that. That is what America's families need.

He also addressed the need for expanded child care so that American families can continue to participate in the economic system of this country and support their families and know that their children are safe, know that their children are receiving child development and afterschool programs for these same children.

Mr. Speaker, this is what America's families need. It is what the President addressed.

SUPPORT FOR RENAMING NATIONAL AIRPORT SHOULD BE BIPARTISAN

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw a demonstration on the differences between the Republican and the Democrat parties.

We had, last night, the President of the United States as our guest in this Chamber. The President was received warmly by Republicans. They clapped, they were very polite, no snickering when he talked about responsibility and personal stuff like that. We were cordial, and we did not mention anything about "you know who."

Now, the same day, the Republicans pushed forward naming the National Airport after Ronald Reagan. He was our leader. We are very proud of him. He was not a perfect president. He did stand tough against the Soviet Union. He created jobs and brought down inflation and did a lot of good things. He won a clean reelection. We are proud of our president.

But, Mr. Speaker, every single one of the Democrats on the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure, on a simply partisan basis, voted against naming the National Airport after Ronald Reagan. And yet did we turn around last night and show what we felt? No, we were very gentlemanly and did the right thing.

I would ask our Democrat counterparts to consider their conduct, because if they want to play partisanship, it is a lot more interesting to talk about this administration than Ronald Reagan's.

STANDING WITH THE PRESIDENT FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, last night the message of the President of the United States was a very strong message. It was a visionary message full of vision and promise for America.

Last night, the American people heard from America's President. He offered for the first time in 30 years a balanced budget. He spoke about the sacred privileges of the patient-physician relationship and demanded that intrusive, hard-knuckled accountants and others who want to look at the numbers do not interfere with good health care in America.

He talked to mothers and fathers who needed child care to raise their children right. He talked about rebuilding our crumbling schools and making a commitment to work with local governments and jurisdictions. And, yes, he emphasized that there is something valuable to every American having affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I heard one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle define the President's program last night in speaking to the public as "left leaning." If that is left leaning, I do not want to be right. I want to stand with the American President and the American people and make their lives better for the 21st century.

CONGRESS SHOULD HONOR RONALD REAGAN

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it will be a fitting tribute when this Congress recognizes the achievements of former President Ronald Reagan by renaming Washington, D.C.'s National Airport in his honor.

Let us recall the challenges our Nation faced when President Reagan took office: an economic crisis, a demoralized and weak military at home. Our allies abroad mistrusted us. The Cold War raged as country after country was falling under the yoke of the Communist Soviet Union. Americans were losing our unique confidence and optimism about the future.

President Reagan conquered all of these challenges. In the process he restored the majesty, the dignity, the moral authority, and our respect for the office of the presidency.

President Ronald Reagan's principled leadership looms even larger today. Let our country honor him and the values he upheld.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH IN CALIFORNIA'S 46TH DISTRICT CONTESTED ELECTION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for an end to the contested election in the 46th District of California. Enough is enough.

It is unfortunate that our second session is starting out much the same as our first session did. Members of the Republican leadership are publicly making unsubstantiated assertions about illegal voting in the 46th District and about the involvement of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

The facts, however, tell a different story. The facts are that the grand jury investigating this matter for 13 months found no credible evidence on which to base a criminal prosecution, not one, although Hermandad was called a criminal organization in this House on this floor. No conspiracy to commit voter fraud was found. The Orange County District Attorney had a thorough and fair investigation. It yielded no indictments.

The facts are that the Committee on House Oversight asked Secretary Jones to investigate a list. He gave us that list back and he said that he could not vouch for any list because he did not know how it was put together. Let us end this sad event in our Congress' history.

AFTER FIVE YEARS, AMERICANS SHOULD REMEMBER THE PLIGHT OF PANAMANIAN KIDNAP VICTIMS

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks the 5-year anniversary of the kidnapping of three American missionaries in South America. On January 31, 1993, armed bandits descended upon the Panamanian village of Pucuro and kidnapped Dave Mankins, Mark Rich, and Rick Tenenoff in the presence of their wives and in the presence of their children.

The gunmen demanded \$1 million in return for the lives of these men, a demand that could not and should not be met.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since these women have seen their husbands, 5 years since these children have spent

Christmas with their fathers, yet this story has made little news and has sparked little protest.

Where is the sense of outrage in our country? Where is the sense of compassion?

Today on this anniversary, and throughout the year, let us remember these families and pray and work for their immediate release.

TIME TO CALL AN END TO SANCHEZ INVESTIGATION

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, simple equity would argue that we ought to end the Sanchez investigation and have Congress pay for the bills that we fostered upon the gentlewoman from California, hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees for a race she won by several hundred more votes than Speaker GINGRICH won his race by several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if decency and honesty will not do it, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should listen to their pollsters. The pollsters say they are driving Hispanic Americans out of the Republican party and away from Republican candidates in record numbers. Why? Because they see the oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we had charges on this floor during the debate of fraud and other criminal activities, all dismissed by local and State people in California. This woman has won this race. It is close to 14 months after the election. Decency would demand that we end this investigation, pay the legal bills, and stop the chicanery. Just because the gentlewoman is a woman Hispanic from California does not mean that my colleagues have the right to drag her through the mud for the entire two-year term. End this investigation.

THANKS TO COACH TOM OSBORNE OF THE NEBRASKA CORNHUSKERS ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great legends of college football retired this season. Dr. Tom Osborne has led the Nebraska Cornhuskers for the past 25 years, and everyone who has watched was saddened by his departure.

Tom Osborne is Cornhusker football. As a young man, I watched him on the sidelines. A man of honor and integrity, a true winner regardless of the outcome of the games.

I watched him coach through years of close games against Oklahoma, near misses for the National Championship, until finally in the past 5 years he has brought home three National Championship seasons, including this year.

More so than football, what Tom Osborne has provided our State of Nebraska and our Nation is a leader who has placed the character development of his young men ahead of their football skills. Tom Osborne never forgot the lessons he learned growing up in Hastings and St. Paul, Nebraska; lessons of faith, values, commitment, doing what you said you would do.

Mr. Speaker, we say to Coach Osborne: Coach, thanks for the memories. We are excited to see what is going to happen in the future. We know that even though you are retiring, you will continue to instill those lessons of faith, character, and development and doing what you said you would do into the young lives of Nebraskans and all America.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONGRES- SIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to welcome Members home to Washington as we begin the 1998 session and to once again invite those who live in the city to call me if they need help from local government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Members who took high school volunteer interns in September when the schools were closed for repair work. Many Members heaped praise on the performance of those D.C. high school interns. They were thrilled by the opportunity to work in Members' offices. The distance between official Washington and hometown Washington disappeared.

We were so impressed by the benefits to all concerned that we have now established a permanent D.C. Congressional Intern program. Interns will compete and be screened and oriented before being assigned to Members. The best and the brightest will be recommended to do such tasks as answering phones, sorting mail, filing, and computer searches.

Almost 100 Members of the House and Senate have already signed up to take interns. I ask Members whether they would like to help a kid from D.C. and get extra help for their office as well.

The program will go from February 3 to May 25. Please call my office and get a free D.C. high school intern.

□ 1330

THE IRS

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the American people now know that the Internal Revenue Service has been breaking the law for over 10 years. Recently the IRS admitted the use of quotas. Charles Rossotti, the present IRS Commissioner, said, this demonstrates that the Agency has failed to strike the

proper balance. It shows the IRS has put too much emphasis on revenue and not enough emphasis on quality customer service and respect for taxpayers' rights.

Frankly, ever since the taxpayers' Bill of Rights 10 years ago, this out-of-control Agency has never struck a balance on anything. The only thing they have struck is fear and intimidation into the hearts of every taxpaying American. This Congress must roll back and curtail the power of the Internal Revenue disservice. We must force this Agency to respect the constitutional rights of the American citizens.

CALL FOR AN END TO INVESTIGATION OF VOTER FRAUD

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the grand jury in Orange County, with all of the available facts and documents and information at their disposal, did not find probable cause to issue even a single criminal indictment concerning voter fraud in LORETTA SANCHEZ's victory. The Republican California Secretary of state, who well over a year ago certified LORETTA SANCHEZ the winner after a painstaking recount, concluded in December that no new evidence warranted changing that result.

In fact, listen to what Secretary Jones had to say about the so-called evidence the Republicans sent to him, and I quote, "We don't know if they are illegal or not because we don't know the status of the individuals on the list or how the list was put together. I can't vouch for the list."

Let me repeat that, "I can't vouch for the list."

Mr. Speaker, that is what we Democrats have been saying all along. This so-called evidence is useless and worthless and nothing more than an attack on Hispanic voters in the Nation. It is time to end this investigation and the enormous amount of taxpayer dollars spent.

UNFAIRNESS IN THE TAX CODE: THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to raise the issue of the marriage tax penalty. Let me just frame this issue by asking some very simple questions. Do Americans feel that it is fair that a married working couple with two incomes pays higher taxes than a similar couple living together outside a marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that the average married working couple, two incomes, pays \$1,400 more in higher taxes? Do Americans feel that it is fair that our Tax Code actually provides an incentive to get divorced? In fact, the only way a married

working couple that pays a marriage tax penalty can avoid it is to file for divorce. That is just wrong.

Think about it. Fourteen hundred dollars, that is a lot of money back in Illinois and throughout this country. Fourteen hundred dollars is 1 year's tuition in a local community college, 3 to 4 months of day care or child care at a local day care center.

We need to make a bipartisan priority this year the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. In fact we look to President Clinton to join with us to make it a bipartisan priority to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—DIS-
MISSAL OF CONTEST IN 46TH
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 341) pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 341

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California by the Secretary of State of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas, a notice of contest of election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas, the task force on the contested election in the 46th District of California met on February 26, 1997 in Washington, DC, on April 18, 1997 in Orange County, California, and on October 24, 1997 in Washington, DC; and

Whereas, Mr. Robert Dornan made unsubstantiated charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and large numbers of individuals voting from the same address; and

Whereas, these charges are without merit, as it was found that those voting from the same address included United States Marines residing at a marine barracks and nuns residing at a domicile of nuns; that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana Zoo; that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas directing the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare its records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas, the INS has complied with the committee's request and, at the committee's request, for over eight months, has engaged in a manual check of its paper files and has provided worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight; and

Whereas, the committee's investigation has extended far beyond a review of those who actually voted in this contested election and;

Whereas, the district attorney of Orange County has ended his investigation and an

Orange County grand jury has refused to return any indictments and allegations of a conspiracy to engage in voter fraud have been proven groundless; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight has received a report from the secretary of State of California, in response to the committee's request, which yielded no new information; and

Whereas, the committee's requests have caused this contest to be needlessly extended for four additional months while the secretary of State of California provided no new information regarding the citizenship status of registrants or voters; and

Whereas, the task force on the contested election in the 46th district of California and the committee have been reviewing these materials and have all the information they need regarding who voted in the 46th district and all the information required to make judgments concerning those votes; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight has after 13 months of review and investigation failed to present any credible evidence demonstrating that Congresswoman Sanchez did not win this election and continues to pursue never ending and groundless areas of investigation; and

Whereas, contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the election contest concerning the 46th district of California is dismissed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, am I correct from a parliamentary standpoint under the rules this resolution would be debatable for 1 hour, if not tabled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair. We would like to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 189, not voting 27, as follows:

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Parker
Archer	Gillmor	Paul
Army	Gilman	Paxon
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pease
Baker	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Goss	Petri
Barr	Graham	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Pitts
Bartlett	Greenwood	Pombo
Barton	Gutknecht	Porter
Bass	Hansen	Portman
Bateman	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Bilbray	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Hefley	Ramstad
Billey	Herger	Redmond
Blunt	Hill	Regula
Boehlert	Hilleary	Riggs
Boehner	Hobson	Riley
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogan
Brady	Horn	Rogers
Bryant	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Houghton	Roukema
Burr	Hulshof	Royce
Burton	Hunter	Ryun
Buyer	Hyde	Salmon
Callahan	Inglis	Sanford
Calvert	Istook	Saxton
Camp	Jenkins	Schaefer, Dan
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Canady	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Kasich	Sessions
Castle	Kelly	Shadegg
Chabot	Kim	Shaw
Chambliss	King (NY)	Shays
Chenoweth	Kingston	Shimkus
Christensen	Klug	Shuster
Coble	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Collins	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cook	Latham	Smith, Linda
Cooksey	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Cox	Lazio	Solomon
Crane	Leach	Souder
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Cunningham	Linder	Stump
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Sununu
DeLay	LoBiondo	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Tauzin
Dickey	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McCollum	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry
Duncan	McHugh	Thune
Dunn	McInnis	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McIntosh	Trafficant
Ehrlich	McKeon	Upton
Emerson	Metcalf	Walsh
English	Mica	Wamp
Ensign	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Everett	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Fawell	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Neumann	Weller
Fowler	Ney	White
Fox	Northup	Whitfield
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Wolf
Ganske	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gekas	Packard	
Gibbons	Pappas	

NAYS—189

Abercrombie	Clay	Doyle
Ackerman	Clayton	Edwards
Allen	Clement	Engel
Andrews	Clyburn	Eshoo
Baesler	Condit	Etheridge
Baldacci	Conyers	Evans
Barcia	Costello	Farr
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Fattah
Bentsen	Cramer	Fazio
Berry	Cummings	Filner
Bishop	Danner	Forbes
Blagojevich	Davis (FL)	Ford
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)
Bonior	DeFazio	Frost
Boswell	Delahunt	Furse
Boucher	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Boyd	Dellums	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Goode
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Green
Cardin	Dixon	Gutierrez
Carson	Doggett	Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)	McDermott	Sabo
Hamilton	McGovern	Sanchez
Harman	McHale	Sanders
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sandlin
Hilliard	McKinney	Sawyer
Hinchey	McNulty	Schumer
Hinojosa	Meehan	Scott
Holden	Meek	Serrano
Hooley	Menendez	Sherman
Hoyer	Millender-	Sisisky
Jackson (IL)	McDonald	Skaggs
Jackson-Lee	Miller (CA)	Skelton
(TX)	Minge	Slaughter
Jefferson	Mink	Smith, Adam
John	Moakley	Snyder
Johnson (WI)	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Stabenow
Kanjorski	Nadler	Stark
Kaptur	Neal	Stenholm
Kennedy (MA)	Oberstar	Stokes
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Strickland
Kildee	Olver	Stupak
Kilpatrick	Owens	Tauscher
Klecza	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Klink	Pascrell	Thompson
Kucinich	Pastor	Thurman
LaFalce	Payne	Tierney
Lampson	Pelosi	Torres
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Levin	Pickett	Turner
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Lofgren	Poshard	Vento
Lowey	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Maloney (CT)	Rahall	Waters
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Manton	Reyes	Waxman
Markey	Rivers	Wexler
Martinez	Rodriguez	Weygand
Mascara	Roemer	Woolsey
Matsui	Rothman	Wynn
McCarthy (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Yates
McCarthy (NY)	Rush	

NOT VOTING—27

Becerra	Hefner	Morella
Berman	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Borski	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	Kennelly	Scarborough
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Schiff
Dooley	Lipinski	Smith (OR)
Ewing	Luther	Tanner
Galleghy	McDade	Wise
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Young (AK)

□ 1404

Mr. METCALF and Mr. FOLEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1997

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file on behalf of the Committee on Commerce a supplemental report to accompany the bill (H.R. 10) the Financial Services Act of 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H.Res. 342) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Budget, David Price of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2174

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2174. It was never my intent to become a cosponsor of this legislation, and I believe a simple clerical error caused my name to be attached.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for today and the remainder of the week and next week, and I yield to the distinguish gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding; and on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, let me just say that I am pleased to announce that we have finished legislative business for this week.

The House will reconvene on Tuesday, February 3rd, at 12:30 for morning hour and 2:00 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices. Members should note that we do not expect any recorded votes on the suspensions before 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3rd.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10:00 a.m. to consider the following legislation: H.R. 2625, the Ronald Reagan National Airport; H.R. 2846, a bill to prohibit spending Federal education funds on national testing; a resolution concerning attorneys' fees, costs, and sanctions payable by the White House Health Care Task Force; a resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the situation in Iraq; and a privileged motion to consider H.R. 2631, which is consideration of the President's veto of the act disapproving his cancellations on the Military Construction Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week by 6

p.m. on Thursday, February 5th. There will be no votes on Friday, February 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), for apprising us of the schedule.

My friend from New York probably noticed that I have a bad voice this afternoon. I would just tell my friend that, as a member of Galludet's board, the University of Galludet, I learned sign language. And while I do not believe we can communicate with each other, I just thought I would share with my friend from New York two signs that I have learned over the years.

This one means "not my problem," just flicking your hands like this. And this one, you have got to take your glasses off and go high up on your nose, means "boring." So I am sure the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, can avail himself of those two signs at the appropriate time in the coming year.

Let me also say to my friend from New York that we are curious on our side of the aisle about not this coming Wednesday but the Wednesday after that. As my colleague knows, both our caucus and conference have conferences scheduled for Monday and Tuesday. Can the gentleman tell us when on Wednesday we can expect votes that week, what time on Wednesday?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, not before 5 p.m. on that Wednesday. That would accommodate both caucuses.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for accommodating us.

The final point I would leave the gentleman from New York with is, I see we do not have the list of bills that will be on suspension next week. We are hopeful that we will maintain the cordiality we were able to put together at the end of the session last year and the Democrats will get a reasonable fair share of suspension bills on the calendar.

Having said that, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), and I wish him a good weekend.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE EDNA F. KELLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to

pay tribute to the late Edna F. Kelly, a Member who served in this body for 19 years, from 1949 to 1968.

Yesterday I spoke about her significant contribution in the foreign policy arena. I would be remiss, however, if I did not also share with my colleagues the gentlelady's achievements on domestic issues.

Early in the 1950s, she was among the first in Congress to advocate for a tax reduction for low-income single parents left with the sole responsibility of caring for their dependent children. Congresswoman Kelly called attention to the inequity in the Tax Code that permitted business deductions for entertainment, but none for child care.

As she said at the time, there certainly can be no question as to the justice for this exemption. This is a measure to protect the family, and it is principally a matter to help protect the children.

Her proposal became part of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The gentlewoman from New York can also be credited with promoting the first equal pay for equal work bill, which she introduced in 1951. It was a landmark effort, which established a new era in the fight for women's equality. Congresswoman Kelly was in attendance when President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law June 10, 1963.

In her later years in Congress, Edna Kelly often spoke with pride of her support for measures that helped this Nation expand social and economic justice and opened doors to housing, education, voting and jobs for all minorities. She received numerous awards, including the Mother Gerard Phelan Award from Marymount College; an honorary doctorate from Russell Sage College, and her alma mater Hunter College's highest honor, the Centennial Medal.

She set a standard of service that made all New Yorkers proud. As our former Governor Hugh Carey said in reference to Congresswoman Kelly, "Her legislative ability and outstanding contributions dispel all doubts about the leadership potential and political acumen of our American womanpower."

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from upstate New York (Mr. SOLOMON), who knew her and worked with her.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from New York for letting me participate in this well-deserved praise of this woman. It is a solemn occasion to join my good friend in paying tribute to this former Member of this body who graced these halls in this House for so long. I am talking about, of course, Congresswoman Edna Kelly from New York who did pass away, as the gentleman just said, last month at the age of 91.

Although I did not have the privilege of serving with her, I watched her for many years and saw her reputation

being so impeccable; her dignity and her good nature were just so overwhelming. As a matter of fact, my personal secretary today was in the Congress back in those days as a staffer, and she just told me before I came over here that she was one of the nicest ladies that she had ever met in her life.

Mrs. Kelly was so quick to dispel those myths that women did not belong in politics, with her quick wit and strong character. Back in those days there were few women in this Congress, as the gentleman knows. In fact, she went on to a distinguished 20-year career, serving from 1949 until 1969. All along the way, she won the respect and she won the admiration of her colleagues on both sides of this aisle.

All you need to look at are the comments other Members of the House made right on this very floor almost 30 years ago to mark her retirement from this Congress. Particularly then Minority Leader and soon to be President Gerald Ford of Michigan rose to pay tribute to Mrs. Kelly. I think President Ford summed up Edna's service well when he said "Her service has been extraordinary. Her departure means a loss of her talents and her charm which will be felt by all of us, on both sides of the aisle, in the future."

Mr. Speaker, that is so very true. For me, I guess probably the thing I admire most and respect Mrs. Kelly for was her commitment to fighting communism and its advance in Europe and throughout the world. Her service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where I used to serve years ago, and her courage and devotion to protecting our allies, our friends in Europe, during the height of the Cold War, are just so, so very commendable. She certainly played no small role in standing up to the spread of deadly atheistic communism and the eventual rollback that would take place in Europe and all over the world some years after her departure from this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, she is another one of those Cold War heroes to which we all owe a great deal for our position today as the lone superpower of the world. For that she should never be forgotten. But her service to her community, as Mr. TOWNS has outlined so well, in Brooklyn, New York, and to all New Yorkers, not to mention her commitment to the American family and the welfare of our children, goes absolutely unsurpassed on the floor of this chamber.

So it is for her strength and her commitment, as much as her elegance and charm, that she will be remembered and sorely missed. My heart goes out to her family and her sister, her two children, eight grandchildren and 17 great-grandchildren, one of whom, her daughter Pat Kelly, is a longtime faithful employee of this House. Formally she was a staffer on the Committee on Rules many years ago, and where I now have the privilege of serving.

So I would just again thank the gentleman from New York. The gentleman

is just as commendable as Mrs. Kelly was. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman, too, and I appreciate his bringing this on the floor today in honor of this wonderful woman.

I thank the gentleman from New York for the time.

Mr. TOWNS. I would like to thank my colleague from New York for his comments.

Of course, I think that when we look back at her work, I think we can say that she used the philosophy to "let the work I have done speak for me." I think she has done a magnificent job, and, of course, let me say to the family the fact that we have lost her, but the point is that the work that she has done will live on and on and on.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the legacy of Edna Flannery Kelly, a longtime Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Brooklyn, who departed this life on December 14, 1997 at the age of 91.

Mrs. Kelly served for 20 years as a Democrat in the House of Representatives, from 1949 to 1969, where she was the first woman elected to Congress from Brooklyn.

In a political career that spanned the turbulent decades of the 50s and 60s, Edna Kelly earned national acclaim for strengthening U.S. foreign policy to meet the threat of communist expansionism in Europe and Asia. In addition, her initiatives to improve the economic status of American families as well as her support of civil rights legislation, paved the way for greater opportunity for all Americans.

Mrs. Kelly's rise to the national political scene, spoke of her strong character, sharp intellect, and gracious charm. She didn't consider a career in politics until the unexpected death of her husband in 1942. In 1949, she won a special election to the 81st Congress, filling the unexpired term of deceased Democratic Congressman, Andrew L. Somers. Subsequently, she was reelected to Congress nine times in landslide victories by her constituency, and from 1956 to 1968, served as the Democratic National Committeewoman from the State of New York.

Many of Mrs. Kelly's proposals became law during the administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. One such measure was an amendment to the Mutual Security Act in 1951, which instigated one of the largest, international humanitarian efforts to help resettle people dislocated by World War II. As a result of the Kelly amendment, more than a million and a half displaced persons, most from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, were able to find new homes and opportunities, enabling them to rebuild their lives.

Mrs. Kelly is remembered for sponsoring the legislation that created the Peace Corps, and was also instrumental in establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Her statesmanship and diplomatic skills were recognized by President John F. Kennedy, who appointed her a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations in 1963.

Throughout her service in Congress, Edna Kelly worked to improve health and education and the standard of living of American families. She also looked to the needs of those most vulnerable—the sick, the disabled, the elderly, and the poor and underprivileged.

Her constituents benefited greatly from her commitment to them as she was able to assess their needs and provide leadership on a variety of issues. She often spoke with pride of her support for different measures that helped the nation expand social and economic justice as well as open doors to housing, education, voting, and jobs for all minorities.

On leaving the House of Representatives, Mrs. Kelly was accorded the highest tribute by her colleagues on both sides of the political aisle. Speaker John W. McCormack, Tip O'Neill, Gerald Ford, Hugh Carey, Claude Pepper, and many others, stood up in the House to praise her outstanding legislative service and contributions to American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the spirit and legacy of Edna F. Kelly, a great American and life-long resident of New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Edna Kelly, life-long New Yorker, is a great one. Mrs. Kelly represented Brooklyn—and was the first woman to do so—for 19 years. She was an effective and articulate expert on both foreign affairs and domestic issues. A champion of NATO and an expert on Soviet Bloc countries, Mrs. Kelly also sponsored measures to help refugees and displaced people after World War II and helped create the Peace Corps program. She advocated for equal pay for equal work for women and for better women's access to child care, credit, pensions, housing and educational opportunities.

Mrs. Kelly's accomplishments were all the greater for the fact that she operated in an almost exclusively male political world. Her intelligence and tenacity earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues. We will all miss her.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CRANE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MORE CHOICE IN MEDICAL TREATMENT NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say to my colleagues, I was so happy last night to hear the President in his State of the Union speech talk about giving our constituents, the people of this country, the opportunity to choose the doctor of their choice and, together with that doctor, decide what kind of treatment they want.

Over the past week and a half, back in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which is around the city of Pittsburgh, I have been holding some fact-finding sessions on health care. The reason we did this is because we kept getting calls, either from doctors or other health care providers, who were distraught, and that is the only way to describe them, because they could not be included in an HMO network where their patients had purchased the insurance.

On the other side you had patients who, because of the high cost of insurance, are being herded into HMOs, thinking that they have the choice of their doctor, only to find out that they have a primary care physician that they can choose among a group, or one is assigned to them, and only that physician can decide whether they can go to another doctor, whether they can see a specialist, or what hospital they can go to. And all of a sudden, particularly for those of us who live in the Pittsburgh region, where Dr. Jonas Salk 4 decades ago solved the solution to polio, where, during the 1970s and 1980s, great doctors like Thomas Starzl developed transplant surgery and antirejection drugs so that people can get new organs, they can have their bodies repaired.

What a great time to live in and what a great geographic region to live in, where people from all over the entire world would come to our Pittsburgh region for this medical treatment. Yet people who live right across the street from those hospitals, a block away from these doctors' offices, do not have access to those doctors, because their health care plan will not let them go there.

So when the President said last night this is a decision that should be up to the person, as to where they get their health care, what doctor they see, it should be up to the doctor and patient together to decide how long you are in the hospital, what kind of medication you take, I was pleased to see Members on both sides of the aisle rise and applaud. It tells me that this Congress is serious about not acting as just Democrats or not acting just as Republicans, but acting as Americans, to give people the choice of the health care that they need.

I saw people come into my hearing who had tears streaming down their face saying that their husband passed away. Now I do not have insurance, I am not old enough for Medicare yet. I have got a preexisting condition. I have got diabetes. I am going blind. What are my choices? Where do I get insurance?

How about the 23-year-old kid, not any longer on their parents' insurance policy, out in the workplace, but in this day and age only capable of getting a part-time job? That is the new style in America today, work people 30 hours, 35 hours, 36 hours, just enough under the 40-hour workweek so they do not get benefits. Then the insurance companies refuse to deal with an individual, just selling them an insurance policy.

Back in 1993 and 1994, we had a debate on what was then called the Clinton health care policy. It was a very large, massive piece of legislation. I was on one of the committees of jurisdiction.

I did not support that legislation. It seems that after we had that debate and we failed in a bipartisan fashion to decide how that trillion-dollar industry called health care is going to be operated, that the insurance companies now have taken it upon themselves. They now control the purse strings. It is not managed care; it is managed dollars. We are not managing the care, where we are telling people that you have access to that care; we are managing the amount of resources.

So a primary care physician is appointed by a health insurance company. They know that he or she will only be successful if they give a limited amount of referrals out of network, or a limited amount of referrals to specialists. So those kind of referrals, in many instances, are very hard to come by.

We heard story after story of people who were released from the hospital too early. One gentleman in his seventies, with a Medicare HMO, was in an automobile accident. His wife was in the car accident with him. She had trauma to her heart in the accident. She was not hurt as seriously as he was though. He had kidney damage, had to have a catheter, had the orbit bones in his face broken. They took him from Westmoreland County into the city of Pittsburgh to the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, where all the wonderful transplant procedures are done. Because they did not know how they were going to treat these broken orbit bones, they released him from the hospital on a stretcher in an ambulance.

Those stories are too frequent, they are too sad. People must have the choice. Health care must be affordable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATE SPENDING LEVELS CONTAINED IN H. CON. RES. 84

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD revisions to the aggregate spending levels contained in H. Con. Res. 84 and a revised allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$360,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$20,000,000 in additional outlays for "Payment of International Arrearages."

The House Committee on Appropriations submitted the conference report on H.R. 2159, a bill making appropriations for the Foreign

Operations for Fiscal Year 1998 which includes \$360,000,000 in budget authority and \$20,000,000 in outlays for international arrearages.

These adjustments took effect upon enactment P.L. 105-118.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x2-7270.

The adjustments are set forth on the attached table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[Dollar in millions]

Discretionary	Current Allocation		Change		Revised Allocation	
	BA	O	AB	O	BA	O
General Purpose	\$520,165	\$549,878	+360	+20	\$520,525	\$549,898
Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund	5,500	3,592			5,500	3,592
Total	525,665	553,470	+360	+20	526,025	553,490

The aggregate levels for budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 1998 are increased as follows:

[Dollar in millions]

Current Aggregates		Change		Revised Aggregates	
BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
\$1,387,228	\$1,372,502	+\$360	+\$20	\$1,387,588	\$1,372,522

Pursuant to Sec. 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84, The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1998 and Title V of P.L. 105-83 making Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1998, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revised allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations to reflect \$700,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$248,000,000 in additional outlays for

"Priority Federal Land Acquisitions and Exchanges."

Sec. 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84 requires that the Chairman of the Budget Committee to make an adjustment " * * * after the reporting of an appropriation measure * * * that provides \$700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, * * * "

Title V of P.L. 105-83 provides "That moneys provided in this title, when combined with moneys provided by other titles in this Act, shall for purposes of section 205(a) of H. Con. Res. 84 (105th Congress) be considered to provide \$700,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority land exchanges."

The adjustments are shown on the attached table.

ADJUSTMENTS FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS—COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[Dollars in millions]

	Current allocation		Change		Revised allocation	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
General purpose discretionary	\$520,525	\$549,898	+700	+248	\$521,225	\$550,146
Violent crime reduction trust fund	5,500	3,592			5,500	3,540
Total	526,025	553,490	+700	+248	526,725	553,738

Aggregate levels for budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 1998 remain unchanged as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Budget authority	\$1,387,588
Outlays	\$1,372,522

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INVOLVING AMERICAN PEOPLE IN SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, last night in the President's State of the Union address, he talked about something that is important to all Ameri-

cans, and what he said was let's save Social Security.

What I think that means for all of us is that we get involved in that debate, because what he outlined was the beginning of a conversation wherein groups like Concord Coalition or AARP would be involved in town meetings throughout this next year, and then in December there would be a Social Security summit at the White House, and maybe the possibility of legislative change after that.

Well, there have been a number of us here in the House that have been talking about Social Security for some time, and what needs to take place right now is that all Americans, as they think about Social Security, I would beg of them to be involved in this debate, because there is nothing more important to a whole lot of Americans than will or will not their Social Security check be there and waiting for them.

□ 1430

I think that as we begin to think about it, we all know the problem. The problem has been very well described. The Social Security trustees said that if we do nothing to save Social Security, it goes bankrupt in 30 years and it begins to run structural deficits in about 15 years. What the trustees' report also showed was that if we do nothing to save Social Security, that the average rate of return for somebody working and paying into Social Security is but 1.9 percent. Mr. Speaker, 1.9 percent. That is not the American dream.

The American dream is built upon putting a little bit of money away that actually grows towards something. But in this case, it is the case of putting money into a system; again, we are not talking about my grandmother's Social Security or my mother's Social Security, but we are talking about each of my three boys' Social Security. And that idea of earning 1.9 percent overall is bad, but what the trustees' report

also shows is that anybody born after 1948 will get a negative rate of return on their Social Security investment.

So as we think about this debate that is soon coming to this Congress and is soon coming to the White House, we ought to think about a couple of things. We ought to think about how do we fix it, because that is the big question. Do we simply cut benefits? I live along the coast of South Carolina and the retirees that I talk to there think that is a horrible idea. That is not the way to fix Social Security.

We have many young people. Other people say, all right, if we cannot cut benefits, maybe we can raise payroll taxes. I think that is a crazy idea, because the young people that I talk to on a daily basis at home in South Carolina say that the idea of raising payroll taxes would squeeze them that much more. We can only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip and those young families that I talk to say they are squeezed. The idea of raising taxes would hurt them.

That only leaves one other option out there for saving Social Security and that is letting one earn more on their Social Security investment, more than this 1.9 percent or more than this negative number. That is, I think, the significance of at least thinking about the idea of personal savings accounts. Because when personal savings accounts have been tried around the globe, people overwhelmingly have elected that option.

In South American countries, 95 percent of the workers in Chile chose the idea of personal savings accounts. In Great Britain, whose demographics are remarkably similar to our own, 75 percent of the workers chose the option of personal savings accounts, or in our own country, a number of counties down in south Texas ran into the same problem we are running into in terms of demographics. They said, how are we going to fix Social Security, and prior to 1983 at the county government level, the State government level, one could create one's own Social Security system. Those counties in south Texas did and 80 percent of the workers, when given the option of personal savings accounts, chose that option.

So I think that as we think about this debate that is coming our way, we really need to look at how do we save Social Security, and I think at least part of the formula for saving Social Security will be the option of personal savings accounts. Not mandatory, but again, leaving people above the age of 65 alone. We do not yank the rug out from underneath seniors, but offer the young people the choice, if it makes more sense for them and for their families, this option of personal savings accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

SANCHEZ WON FAIR AND SQUARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today this House took an action that I think does not speak well of the premise that if one runs fairly and wins fairly, one should be allowed to serve fairly.

Leader GEPHARDT offered to this House an opportunity to move democracy forward by ceasing and desisting from the pursuit of an investigation against Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, who won her election fair and square in California.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to challenge the injustice to a person who deserves justice. I rise today concerning the continuing investigation of the Committee on House Oversight into the partisan political crusade that they have carried on in an effort to harass Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ since she defeated Bob Dornan in the last congressional election. That committee, despite the lack of any shred of credible evidence, has dragged on its investigation for no other reason except partisan politics. We already know that the constituents of LORETTA SANCHEZ' district appreciates her service, has received her well, agrees with her positions, and she is serving them well.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in American lingo, the jig is up. An Orange County grand jury has concluded its investigation of Mr. Dornan's delusions of voter fraud and concluded there was no credible evidence to indict anyone and that there was no criminal conspiracy to commit voter fraud. This is the system that we put in place, and that system has determined that there is no criminal acts to be prosecuted.

Mr. Dornan's accusations that a Latino civil rights organization conspired to commit voter fraud in order to defeat him did not stand up under the scrutiny of an Orange County grand jury investigation. What Mr. Dornan now needs to understand and the Committee on House Oversight needs to determine once and for all is that LORETTA SANCHEZ beat Bob Dornan and LORETTA SANCHEZ has been properly representing the people of the 46th District in California. Get a grip, understand reality, be fair, and allow this particular Congressperson to have the same kind of justice that any one of us would want to have and to be able to represent her constituents.

This is a shameless vendetta carried on by Mr. Dornan against Latino voters, and it now must come to an end. The local prosecutors have concluded their investigation. It is now time for the Members of the Committee on

House Oversight to pull up its stakes and stop spending our taxpayers' dollars chasing the smoke screen being spread by former Members.

This is a former Member whose own colleagues have recognized him as an embarrassment to the principles of this House. His outrageous behavior on the floor of the House in doing various acts of swearing, insulting and threatening other Members was without precedent in this august body. When the House voted to revoke his privilege as a former Member from coming to the floor, that should serve, or should have served, as our notice about the credibility of these charges. That vote was a blight on a former Member that was unprecedented and should have moved the committee to hasten the conclusion of its proceedings. But the members of the committee have continued to follow the lead from this defeated, radical, right wing ideologue, flying in the face of that vote, and now the conclusions of a local grand jury. The committee keeps up its witch-hunt to invalidate votes in Congresswoman SANCHEZ'S 1996 election.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dornan and his band of followers need to now admit to themselves the simple fact that the voters in California's 46th Congressional District understood in November of 1996 LORETTA SANCHEZ beat Bob Dornan fair and square. Get a life, and let us get over it. But more importantly, let us move forward. Let us allow this House to proceed, accepting every single Member that has been duly elected by their constituents. We cannot do it with the votes we have on the Democratic side of the aisle; we know the Republicans have the upper hand, but we call upon our fair-minded colleagues. This is not a partisan issue, this is a fairness issue for the Democratic and Republican constituents of the 46th District. I believe that taxpayers' money should not be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that these individuals who have control over this process be allowed, of course, to cease and desist from doing this particular proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, let me tell my colleagues just a brief reason, or reasons, why LORETTA SANCHEZ and others of us need to get on with our business. I want to emphasize some remarks I heard earlier today on the President's vision in his State of the Union, and just simply say, we need all of the hands we possibly can get to do what the American people have asked us to do. One, to save Social Security. I applaud the process that the President has offered. And then lastly, we need all the hands to make sure that health care is the right kind of health care for all Americans, and that it is not dictated by gurus sitting up in ivory towers saying that the bottom line is about money. We need all of our voters, Mr. Speaker, all of our Members, and I hope we can get on with the business of the House and the American people.

APPRECIATION FOR FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Maine people are no strangers to tough winters, but the ice storm we just endured struck a terrible blow. Damage will exceed \$100 million. When Vice President GORE toured the State, he said it looked like we had been hit by a neutron bomb. And that is a pretty accurate description. The damage from the ice storm which accumulated over several days snapped off telephone poles. We had 2,500 telephone polls in the State which needed to be replaced. It essentially dropped the forest canopy about 25 feet, the hardwoods broke off at the top, branches broke off, and they took power lines down with them all across the State. Some roads were impassable, blocked by fallen trees and downed power lines. Thousands of people were left in the dark and cold. Mr. Speaker, 600,000 people, one-half of the residents of the State of Maine, were without electricity for some time, and some of them had no power for as long as 2 weeks. As my colleagues can imagine, that can try the patience of even the toughest Yankee who has faced some very tough nor'easters. Thousands of families with no heat found themselves stoking up old wood stoves and huddling in front of fireplaces. For those who depend on well water, no electricity meant no pump, no pump meant no water. Those close to a pond or river hauled water in buckets. No running water meant no toilets, no bathing, no washing dishes or washing clothes.

I have to say that all of this produced a very brisk business in chain saws, generators and kerosene space heaters. Not only was the power out, but it was very cold. Our schools were closed for up to 2 weeks in different parts of Maine and daily life was disrupted for thousands of families.

During those 2 weeks, I went to a number of shelters in Maine and I want to tell my colleagues, there are some wonderful stories, hundreds of stories of people pulling together to help each other and make a community humanitarian effort. I will never forget certain aspects of my experience going into those shelters. There would be some older people, some on oxygen, on cots on one side of the room, a gym or some other facility, there would be younger kids being taken care of by their parents, there would be a soccer game in the middle of the gymnasium or the shelter, but I will also remember most, what I will carry with me as long as I live, is the look on the faces of the teenagers, many of whom had not volunteered I suspect for anything like this for a long period of time, but there they were, cutting up carrots, moving cots, bringing blankets, helping to move equipment, and making sure that other people were well cared for. It was

for them an experience that may help them understand their connection to others and the importance of community.

Fire and rescue crews went door to door in some places checking on townspeople, seeing who was okay; others took generators and portable generators and moved around from home to home warming up one home, unplugging the generator, going to another home, trying to keep as many people as possible warm, and as many pipes as possible from freezing. Our radio stations canceled normal programming and took calls around the clock; that was real helpful for building a sense of community, and television stations had special programs and hotlines.

We could not have done this without outside help, and I am here today to say thank you to the rest of the country.

Let me give some examples of how we were helped. Central Maine Power Company, our major utility, usually has 92 crews, and during the height of our resistance to this storm, we had 1,000 utility crews working. They came from Maryland and Delaware and North Carolina and South Carolina; they came from Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island and New York, they came from all over the East Coast and they provided an invaluable service. One truck had on it a sign on the side: Maine or bust. And they showed up. Some of those folks arrived from North Carolina at the Brunswick Naval Air Station and they were given jackets from L. L. Bean, donated by L. L. Bean. They had worked on utility lines all their lives, some of those people, never in such cold, and I just want to say that we could not have done it without the assistance of people from other States.

I would also say that the response of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, was outstanding. James Lee Witt came to the State, he and his people did an extraordinary job. The Federal Government stepped forward when it was needed and helped Maine people when they needed it most.

I just will say in conclusion, I will never see scenes on television of a flood or hurricane and not remember how the people of this country stood up for people in Maine when we needed help.

□ 1445

MANAGED HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to start out this afternoon by saying how happy I was with the President's State of the Union address last evening and the reaction of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

The President stressed his pro-family, pro-child message. It is an agenda that I think that everyone can get behind. It will have the strong support of the American people. And it is very important, I think, that in order for us to enact this agenda, that we get the Republicans, both the leadership and the rank and file, together with my Democratic colleagues so that we can enact what are essentially common sense proposals in 1998.

I, along with several of my colleagues who will join me this afternoon, just wanted to call attention to two points that the President raised with regard to health care reform which I think are particularly important.

One is managed care reform. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK), who is going to be joining us soon here, stressed that during the break, during the congressional district work period. Congressman KLINK, myself, and others had a number of forums in our districts where we heard from our constituents about the problems with managed care, with HMOs and managed care organizations.

I thought it was particularly interesting last evening that when the President mentioned the need for consumer protections and a consumer Bill of Rights to deal with managed care organizations, that the response was overwhelming. I think it had a better response from the Congress, again on a bipartisan basis, than almost anything else that he talked about. I think that is because we are hearing from our constituents and they are telling us the problems and the horror stories that exist with regard to existing managed care organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this point yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who I was listening to his comments before and they are really appropriate in terms of some of the problems that we hear from our constituents.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend from New Jersey.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and I and others have had these discussions for years. We have watched as this situation with insurance and availability of insurance, choice of doctors, all of this has deteriorated greatly.

But it was 1995 when probably the most horrendous story that I had ever come into contact with occurred. I became aware of a 4-year-old boy named Sean Brake from a place outside of my district called Plum Borough. The local TV station was doing a story about the fact that Sean's father worked for the insurance company and Sean at the age of 4 had gotten a rare form of cancer, but it was a highly treatable form. With a bone marrow transplant which would cost somewhere around \$200,000 or more, there was a 90 percent chance that Sean would survive, according to the people at Children's Hospital in Pittsburgh,

one of the most renowned children's hospitals in the Nation.

Yet the insurance company would not pay for this. I heard this on the television; and I said, This is amazing. Being a father, here is a 4-year-old child who has a 90 percent chance of treatment if he gets the treatment or he is going to die. And so I called the family and asked if they minded if we got involved. It took me personally, and my staff members, 3 days on the phone.

The problem was that the insurance company that Sean's father worked for would only cover the first \$125,000. They said, Congressman KLINK, it is not that we do not want to pay out this money, but we need to know that our catastrophic carrier will pick up the remainder or why bother?

So I called that other carrier, and they would not talk to me. As a Member of Congress, or as anyone else, they would not speak to me. I could only talk to their lawyer in Chicago.

So I talked to the lawyer; and he said, Look, we view this as experimental. It is too bad. That is a decision we have made, and he was very cold. I could not believe I am talking to another American that is going to let a 4-year-old child die when there is a 90 percent chance to survive. I was appalled, but I could not reach this individual through the phone.

I could not also understand why, if the child was going to have a 90 percent chance of success with this treatment, why is that experimental?

Finally, we found out that the Health Care Finance Administration in its manual says that if an insurance company wants to bid to provide insurance for any Federal employee, it must cover this procedure. It is not experimental according to HCFA.

So we called them back and said, Being good citizens of this good United States, if you do not cover this we are going to have to inform the Federal Government. Every contract you have with the Federal Government will be canceled, and you will not be able to bid for any more.

Mr. Speaker, very quickly they called us back and said, We will take care of Sean Brake.

I had a wonderful opportunity a year ago to sit with Sean Brake and his mother. He is alive and thriving, and the bone marrow transplant worked. But why did it take a Member of Congress and his entire staff 3 days to get this child the care in the United States of America that every child should be able to get?

We have had people sitting in front of us. A lady who was a diabetic sat there. Her husband had to take an early retirement from Sears & Roebuck. Under COBRA, he is covered; and she is sitting there with tears streaming down her face.

She said, There are two things that I love more than anything in the world: Number one, I love my husband; and, number two, I am a real flag waver. I love my country.

But I am going blind from diabetes. My husband and I are not old enough for Medicare yet. We cannot afford insurance because I have a previous condition, and after the COBRA runs out I will not have health care coverage. So my choice is either go blind and die or I can divorce my husband who I love and go on Medicaid. Or I can leave this country, go to Canada, become a citizen and then I will have socialized medicine.

What choices are we giving the citizens of this Nation today?

I have to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). The gentleman has led this fight here in Congress. He has informed many of us, his colleagues and friends, of things that are going on. The gentleman brings great knowledge and emotion to this debate and discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the insurance industry around this Nation that the people are leading and the leaders will follow. People are angry. They are upset. They pay increasingly more of their money in premiums and the insurance companies give them less in service, less in access, no choice of medications.

Last night, Members in a bipartisan fashion reacted favorably to the President's comments. This is just the beginning. They had better straighten up. They better start thinking about managing real care, not just moving dollars around. Stop giving these seven- and eight-figure salaries to their top executives while they are not giving care to the people who pay the premium for the policy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments. I think that what the gentleman is pointing out, and obviously what we all must do but he has done it so well today and, I know, beforehand, is to give the individual cases of how people are individually impacted by managed care and the problems that we are hearing from our constituents. Because everyone can relate to it. It is direct.

The gentleman mentioned again about last night in the State of the Union address how, when the President spoke about this, how there was such a positive reaction on both sides of the aisle. But we know that the Republican leadership, unlike many of the Republican colleagues, rank and file colleagues, have already joined together with this coalition of certain business and insurance interests. They are starting this million dollar campaign to try to fight the consumer protections that we are talking about and that the President talked about last night.

My understanding is that next week some of these special interests are going to be down here, and we are going to have a battle. We know we are

going to have a battle. It is just like we had with kid's health care and with the portability provisions of Kennedy-Kassebaum.

We know that the people and most of our colleagues support this, but we are going to get these special interests and big money campaigns supported by the Republican leadership against it, and we are just going to have to keep bringing up these cases and the problems that our constituents talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania again. I know it is just the beginning.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, if my friend would again yield, I think my point on that would be we know that there is a tremendous amount of money and power and influence. This is a trillion dollar industry. The profits that are to be made in denying people their health care and pocketing the money is an extraordinary amount of money.

In 1993 and 1994, those insurance interests were able to put the Harry and Louise ads on television, spend tens of millions of dollars, and they could make the public believe they do not want government health care.

Today in America everyone knows the kind of health care that is available, but they also understand it is not available to them. Everyone we talk to has a horror story. Even those people who can afford the best health care know that when they go to the hospital, the hospitals have had to cut back on the number of nurses so they cannot get care. They ring the call button and no one shows up.

I had a gentleman who manages billions of dollars of securities at one of the largest investment firms in Pittsburgh who told me a horror story about having a back operation. He has got money. That is not a problem.

He goes to the hospital and because of the cutbacks forced by the HMOs saying to the hospital that they will take less of a reimbursement because all of these patients are ours; we are taking our piece off the top. He had to be turned X-number of degrees every so many hours or he will go crippled. He said, Congressman KLINK, I could not get a nurse.

People know this, no matter how much money they spend against us, the kind of care they are denied. And they cannot get the medication they want because deals have been made between the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies that they will only sell our drugs. Patients do not even get the generic brand anymore; they get the cheapest in that classification of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, people know this. They are feeling this every day. The public will carry this battle on their shoulders. We just need to be there with them as the voice in the people's House to say to the special interests who are making billions of dollars, the people of this country deserve health care.

If patients are pro-life, people are dying. If patients are pro-choice, they

should have a choice of their own doctor; they should have a choice of their own medication; they should have a choice to stay in the hospital if their doctor thinks they need to.

It does not matter where people stand on these arguments. Both sides can find something that is going to bring us to the argument that the system as a status quo is not working.

In 1993, 53 percent of the people who were working in this Nation were in HMOs. Today, 85 percent of the public are in HMOs. They have captured the market, but they are not delivering the service.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again. We are obviously going to continue with this over the next few weeks and months until we get this legislation passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey; and it is good to be back talking about issues that are facing the American public and critical issues.

And I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I had the opportunity to read through the newspaper clippings of the forum that the gentleman held on managed care, and it is heartrending what is going on in people's lives. The gentleman really is eloquent and a champion of people who are looking, desperately looking for some way in which they can figure out the system or not have the system be detrimental to their health. That is not what it is about. That is not the goal in health care.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues; and I know that we are going to be joined by my colleague from New York.

This is a critical debate in the country today. I think, as both of my colleagues have said, I think the President laid out a challenge to all of us last night when he said that we must address the issue of managed care reform. And I think in this body, on both sides of the aisle, there was a cheering and people who are ready to take on this challenge. I think this ought to be one of the first issues that we address, since there is good, solid bipartisan support and it is a problem, as we have all concluded, that is affecting so many Americans.

I think why there is such tremendous bipartisan support on this issue is because every single Member of this body is listening very carefully to those who put their faith and their trust in us to represent them on the serious issues that they are facing. Everyone is hearing about the horrors of managed care. My hope is that we respond and that we respond quickly.

□ 1500

Today it seems that HMOs are valuing the healthy profits over healthy pa-

tients. We understand that there has to be costs that are cut. Everybody wants to try to make health care and health insurance more affordable, but you have to take a look at what price and if you are sacrificing the health and safety of the American people, then that is not the goal, that is not the goal.

I was over at a large senior housing complex in my district last week, a place called Bella Vista, which means good vistas, good life. And there were about 100 people in the room. I was just talking to them about the changes in Medicare, what they might be looking forward to and also about the extension of Medicare to people who are 55 to 64, et cetera. One woman raised her hand. She was carrying around an oxygen cart. She told me her story of her husband, middle of the night, rushed to the hospital, cancer patient, had a stomach blockage, goes to the emergency room. They examined him, said, you are fine, you do not have to stay.

I said, you should have made a fuss there. She said, I did. I did.

She said, they told me that my husband did not have to stay, that he is fine, that he is all right, that they would not admit him. I tried.

And within several days her husband was dead. She said to me, what should I have done? You are left standing there.

This is real life. She said he was a cancer patient. So you are hard-pressed. I can get back to her and say, and I said to her, we are working on that. Well, that is great. She lost her husband. You do not feel like you are really doing your job when you are standing there trying to cope or trying to be empathetic and sympathetic to what is going on in people's lives.

My colleagues here know we have all worked together on the issue of breast cancer patients, women being treated as outpatients for mastectomies. We have a good piece of legislation here with 214 of our colleagues who have signed on. Unfortunately we have not been able to get the leadership in this House to give us the opportunity for a hearing. But over and over again I hear from Members that say, we cannot legislate body part by body part. I understand that. I really do. But we have to address an issue when it comes before us, and we have to take action.

In the same way that we are talking about the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act to prevent that kind of outpatient treatment for women who are undergoing mastectomies, we need to have an overarching set of principles, which we do have in a consumer Bill of Rights for people, something that the President has proposed. There is a piece of bipartisan legislation in this House which we can move on. It is only right. It is only just. It is only what people have every right to expect, that they in fact can get good quality health care, that doctors are not given a gag rule that says that they cannot talk about all the medical options that

are available to people with a specific illness that they have, that they cannot get emergency care because someone is deciding what is emergency care for people when you are sick and you use the emergency room. When you go in and you truly are sick, doctors can determine whether or not someone is seriously ill versus someone that has gone in for something that is minor. But to curtail the medical profession in this regard I believe is wrong, and we have it within our power within this year to pass comprehensive managed care reform so that in fact people are the beneficiaries of the very best in health care that this country has to offer.

I know we want all of our colleagues to participate.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for taking this time and look forward to participating in the conversation.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. As you mentioned, the President basically put out the challenge last night, and it is our obligation now to get the Congress to enact these consumer patient protections. I think what we are just going to do over the next few weeks is basically bring out all these examples and point out how so many of our constituents are negatively impacted and need some kind of Federal regulation or patient protection in order to have quality care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. We are looking at medical science today. I am a cancer survivor, 12 years ago, and I thank God every day for giving me my life back. But we now have the capability with science to look at genes and to look at someone's genetic predisposition to cancer or to diabetes, to any of the diseases that have plagued us. And yet at the same time there is a fear that if you have a genetic predisposition to one of these illnesses, you do not want to say anything, you do not want to tell anybody, because you are fearful that you are going to lose your insurance or you will not be able to get insurance.

Now, this is madness. We are about and the President also talked last night about putting so much more money, millions of dollars more, into research, health research. We will have the capacity to look at these areas. And yet people may not be able to get the kind of health care coverage that they will need if they have this predisposition to illnesses. We cannot go down this road. We just cannot.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree.

I want to yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) who is on the Committee on Commerce with me and who for a long time now has expressed concern over this issue.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for giving us this opportunity and my colleague from Connecticut. You are both so

right. When we talk about health care, it strikes me there is no Democratic health care or Republican health care. There is an American health care, and all Americans of all political stripes, of all persuasions, of all races and creeds and colors and regions of the country are all concerned about their health care. When I speak to my constituents, I know that health care is right up there in terms of things that people are very much concerned about.

My mother, her name is Seroy Engel, she lives in Tamarac, Florida. She is actually in the hospital now as we speak. She is my best advisor in terms of health care and Medicare and she tells me, what are people to do? People in this country, senior citizens who have worked hard all their lives, played by the rules, are retired and they do not have adequate health coverage. Medicare does not pay for prescription drugs. People have to decide whether they are going to eat or take their pills. Sometimes they eat half as much as they should eat and only take half as many pills as they need to take for medical reasons because they simply cannot afford it.

What is happening is that we are not doing the job. The government is not doing the job.

I want to really take my hat off to the President of the United States because I think that last night he made some very bold statements about health care. Several years ago when he put forth his program for health care reform, I supported that program. I am a supporter of the single payer plan as well because I believe that we need to cover every American in this country, that it is a national scandal that 40 million Americans have no health coverage whatsoever. Of those 40 million Americans, people do not realize, 20 percent of them are working people. It is not people who are unemployed. It is working people that do not have health care coverage. To me that is a national disgrace. We could do better in 1998, as we approach the 21st century in this country.

I want to commend President Clinton for raising the issue of health care. When his health care plan was shot down for a few years, no one wanted to touch health care with a 10-foot pole. But now we understand that we have to do it. I am just so proud of the Democrats here in the House because we are grabbing the bull by the horns and we are saying to the American people, we think health care is a priority.

We talked about managed care reform. We are listening to our constituents. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, is so right. Many of these decisions should be made by medical doctors based on what is best for the patient, not what is best for the private dollar, the almighty dollar or the bottom line.

We understand that people are in business to make money, but if you are providing health care, the bottom line, the most important thing is the health

care of that patient. That is really what it should be. So I think that we have a lot of problems to tackle in terms of health care.

We participated in a forum several weeks ago about the President's proposed expansion of Medicare. It was very interesting because yesterday when the President mentioned it during the State of the Union and said he was for expanding Medicare for people who are 62 to 65 or people who are over 55 who have lost their jobs and that these people would pay their own premiums so it would cost the government nothing, the Democrats stood up and applauded. I was really very surprised that on the other side of the aisle the Republicans did not applaud. They just sat there as if they were in opposition to his program.

I have to tell you, when I speak to my constituents, they all think it is marvelous because people who are 62 and have no coverage, they are at great risk. And people who have lost their jobs at 55, they are at great risk. And the Medicare program, we know we have to improve it. And we know we have to get at waste, fraud and abuse.

But we do know that before there was a Medicare program, the vast majority of senior citizens in this country had inadequate or no health care coverage whatsoever. And since Medicare they do have health care coverage. Some of it is inadequate, but at least it is coverage. If we can extend that and at no cost to the government or even a minimal cost to the government, it is not so terrible. If it is a minimal cost to the government, I am all for it. I think the American people are all for it.

I think the Democratic Party has shown that it is on the side of the people, the Democrats in this House, by coming out very forthrightly in support of it. So when we talk about the whole issue in this Congress, and I hope we will, talk about managed care reform, talk about Medicare expansion, talk about giving health care to 40 million Americans that do not have it, I think we ought to be proud to tackle these issues because health care affects everybody, and everybody is concerned with health care.

And so I want to really just commend my colleague for raising the issue, and the President yesterday again brought it to the fore. I think it is something the American people care about and want to talk about.

I think hand in hand the other issue that the President mentioned which I think goes hand and glove with health care is Social Security, because as people get older, they care about Social Security and they care about health care. I think the President saying that if there is any kind of surplus that every dollar of surplus would go to shore up the Social Security system, I think 90 percent at least of Americans would agree with that.

So I look forward to working in this Congress to shore up the Social Security system, if there is a surplus, and if

there is not a surplus we know we need to shore it up anyway and to work on improving health care in this country. We have the greatest system in the world in terms of health care, but we know along the way there are still some problems. I believe that a country that can do so much, as we can do, ought to very basically provide decent health care for all of our citizens.

I look forward to working with the White House and with the President and with the Democrats in Congress, and hopefully the Republicans will come along and work with us in a bipartisan fashion so that we can provide the kind of health care to all Americans that all Americans know we need.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman. I just want to say again with regard to two points, you said about the near elderly. I did not start out this afternoon talking about the near elderly proposal, but that, I think, was just as important in terms of what the President mentioned last night. And one of the things that really aggravates me is that so many of our colleagues on the other side, not so much maybe individuals, but certainly Republican leadership, keep bashing Social Security, keep bashing Medicare. We went through the whole Medicare debate where they talked about how bad Medicare was. The reality is that Medicare is a very good program and Social Security works. People are getting their checks. They get their COLA every year. Medicare works.

And if we can institute a program for the near elderly, for people 55 to 65 or 62 to 64, depending on their circumstances, if they lose their job or their spouse is no longer covered, if we can somehow manage to get the people who need this Medicare coverage into Medicare without any additional cost to the Medicare program, which is what the President is talking about, because they would be paying the premium, why not?

Let some of these people take advantage of the Medicare program, particularly since we know about downsizing, we know about layoffs, we know what is going on out there now so that people in this age bracket, where they are close to 65, increasingly have problems keeping or getting health care coverage.

I would say the same thing about Social Security. Social Security is great. It was a democratic initiative passed by the Democrats. And yes, I think the President is absolutely right. If there is a surplus, when there is a surplus, it should be used for Social Security.

But again I keep hearing on the Republican side about Social Security is broken, we cannot fix it. All these suggestions out there to maybe privatize and move to another way of doing things. I think it is wonderful that the President not only stood up and said, look, Social Security is out there and it is working, but also said that if we have extra money, we should use it to shore up the system.

The difference between the President's approach and the Democrats' approach and what we hear from a lot of the leadership on the Republican side is that we want to improve these programs, Medicare and Social Security. We want to improve them. We know that we can improve them and we are going to put our dollars where our mouths are in terms of improving these programs rather than just say they are not working when they are. They are working.

□ 1515

I wanted to yield again to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I think it is important, so that there is no misconception about what the health care Bill of Rights is, what it contains, so that in fact it is pretty basic. Because the gentleman mentioned that next week there are going to be groups up here who are rallied and organized and very well financed to try to come in with a steamroller, if you will, and just try to knock out this issue of managed care reform.

Also, my colleague from New York made a very good point. Illness is not partisan. It is not gender related. It is not age related. Everyone gets ill. And people do not want to get sick. People would like to be healthy. But there are going to be a group of very, very powerful special interests arrayed with lots and lots of money against this notion of managed care reform.

So in stepping back, very simply, what is the President's challenge? What is it that will have both Republicans and Democrats in this body galvanized around? And, as I say, I think we could move, and move quickly, on this issue. The health care Bill of Rights would simply ensure that patients have access to health care specialists; access to emergency services when and where the need arises; an assurance that medical records will be kept confidential; an access to a meaningful appeals process to resolve differences with health plans and providers; to remove that gag rule that prevents physicians from talking to patients about treatments that might not be covered by their plan, even the treatments that could give them a shot at beating a deadly disease.

These are some of the pieces of the health care Bill of Rights. And it seems to me that this only says people should get the health care that they deserve.

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PALLONE. I am so glad that the gentlewoman went through the list. And, of course, that is sort of general; we could get into the details.

Ms. DELAURO. Right.

Mr. PALLONE. But it is so basic and it so simple, and that is why there was so much support here last night.

Ms. DELAURO. Right.

Mr. PALLONE. And the most amazing thing, if the gentlewoman will re-

member last night when the President spoke and he mentioned the importance of having confidential medical records, and there was a huge roar of applause. And I said to myself, you know, such a simple concept that your medical records should be confidential and should not be available to everyone.

Ms. DELAURO. Everybody.

Mr. PALLONE. And we cannot even guarantee that. We have people spending millions of dollars coming here to Washington next week to start advertising campaigns not to keep your records confidential. It is amazing how basic these things are and yet we are getting the opposition from the other side.

Ms. DELAURO. And that is what the public needs to know, is that there will be an array of very, very powerful special interests that are organizing, taking their resources, vast resources, to try to put an end to managed care reform.

And what the public needs to know is if they do not want that to happen, that they need to get engaged in this process; that they need to be in touch with those of us who serve on their behalf; that they do not want this to happen; that they do in fact want managed care reform and that opportunity for choice, for confidentiality, and for knowing what their options are when they are ill, no matter whether their insurance plan covers that particular option.

Mr. PALLONE. And such a simple concept. I want to yield to the gentleman, but even the disclosure part. We had a hearing last week in New Jersey, Senator TORRICELLI and I, and it was amazing how many of the stories just revolved around people's not knowing what their health plan consisted of. Just a simple statement so that they know what their coverage consists of.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I wanted to again raise the issue of the President's proposal for expanding Medicare, because I think that that is really one of the new proposals that we are going to really have to deal with in this Congress. And I really think that the American people really are interested in it and I think are overwhelmingly in support of it. And I would hope that it does not get buried in the general discussion of health care.

Again, and my colleague was with us when we had the hearings, we had three witnesses all in the category of the 62 to 64 range, age range, and they pointed out that they are the most vulnerable in terms of having no health coverage whatsoever. These are all, again, working people.

There is nothing that aggravates me more, because I represent a working class, a middle class district in New York, of people who have worked hard all their lives, who have played by the rules, who are not looking for hand-

outs, who do not want anything to which they are not entitled, who suddenly find themselves in need, after playing by the rules all their lives, and we say to them, sorry, we cannot help you. That is wrong. And the people who fit into that category, between 62 and 64 and 65, ought to be helped. And people who are 55 and older, who are retired or laid off or unemployed, ought to be helped as well.

You know, there are many, many people who retire after age 55 and their companies promise them that their health care coverage will continue once they retire. And then they retire and suddenly find out that the company revokes it or something happens, and the President's proposal would extend this COBRA coverage which would allow these people to again buy in with their own resources and to have a continuation of the health coverage that they had when they were working.

Who could object to that? Especially if we can find innovative ways and people can pay the premiums so the cost to the government would be minimal. It would seem to me like apple pie and motherhood. It should be something that everybody supports.

It is very disheartening to see that the same forces who opposed Medicare in the 1960s are the same ones who are now saying, no, no, we cannot expand it, we should not expand it, let it wither on the vine, or whatever the speeches are. Everybody should be embracing this Medicare expansion because it is good for people and it is good for America.

And, after all, we are 435 of us here, Democrats and Republicans, we were all elected to do what is good for America. And I can think of nothing better that is good for America than to try to expand health care coverage to average people who have worked hard all their lives, who have played by the rules, who do not look for handouts, just look for fairness and equity.

And I want to again say how proud I am of the Democrats in the House of Representatives for putting forward these proposals and the President of the United States for putting forward these proposals and for us to say we are going to make this health care coverage, these health care proposals our number one priority in this Congress, and let the American people decide what they want and let the American people see who is really acting in their interests.

So, again, I am proud to stand with the Democrats in this House to say that we will not stop until we expand coverage for Americans, until we make sure that Americans get adequate health coverage and we make sure that decisions are made based on what is best for the patient, not what is best for the bottom line or the profit or the almighty dollar.

We, again, understand people need to make profits, but the bottom line is health care for the sick, health care for all Americans, quality care. That is the most important thing.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman, and while he was talking about the hearing that we both attended, where Secretary Shalala, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, spoke, I was just looking over a summary of what she outlined as to briefly why this near elderly proposal was necessary and the specifics, which is pretty basic, of who would be covered.

If I could just mention it very briefly, what she said is that a lot of people in this age bracket lose their coverage because an older spouse becomes eligible for Medicare and retires, ending their work-based coverage. That is one category. Then we have, of course, we mentioned others who lose their coverage because of downsizing or layoffs, which of course happens very frequently. And then the third are the people who lose their insurance when employers either unexpectedly drop their retirement health care plans or somehow change the plan. And as the gentleman knows, a lot of people expect that they will continue to have coverage but all of a sudden their employer decides to drop it or change it.

There were three components that Secretary Shalala mentioned to the proposal. One is that Americans aged 62 to 65 can buy into Medicare by paying the full premium. Second, displaced workers over age 55, who have involuntarily lost their jobs and their health care coverage, can buy into Medicare by paying the full premium. And last, that Americans age 55 and older, whose companies reneged on their commitment to provide retiree health benefits, are given a new option through extending the COBRA.

Now, the President's proposal does not get into this, but when the gentleman and I were at that hearing that day, we also mentioned the possibility, which I know the two of us would like to see, of probably providing some sort of sliding scale subsidy so that people who could not afford the full premium would still be able to buy into it. And I think that in the context of the tobacco settlement or other monies that might be available, we could probably do something like that and still keep the budget balanced.

Mr. ENGEL. Let me say also, I think we could probably cut back on waste, fraud and abuse in the Medicare system and find the money to finance what the gentleman just described.

Mr. PALLONE. True.

Mr. ENGEL. I go to senior citizen centers in my district and I always get a lot of heads nodding when I say there is a problem with something with Medicare. And sometimes we have difficulty where we get, we are in a hospital stay and we get a printout afterwards and we see the monies that Medicare has spent. And we see listings sometimes of doctors' names, and we say who are these doctors I do not know who they are. I did not see them. And it is the doctor who pokes his head in the door and asks how you are feel-

ing today and then leaves and bills Medicare. And when people say that, or when I say that, people nod all the time.

I am sure all our colleagues have countless stories that constituents have told them about waste, fraud and abuse in the Medicare system, where people are told that they can get certain things, and they get them and they do not need them. I really believe if we crack down on waste, fraud and abuse we could save billions. And by saving that money, we could put it into ensuring that everybody gets expansion of health care coverage and that people that do not have it can get it.

So I think where there is a will there is a way. We certainly are capable of looking at it. And we know there is waste, fraud and abuse, and we can get at it.

So I again think that the President's proposal is something that has a lot of merit. I know the American people, I have seen polls, are all for it. I know my constituents in New York are for it. And I think, again, that those of us in Congress who understand the necessity for the expansion of Medicare, particularly on the Democratic side, and I hope again our colleagues on the Republican side will embrace it as well, but I know on the Democratic side we are embracing it and that we will continue to push for Medicare expansion in this Congress and hopefully get a bill that the President will sign into law.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman again, and I will yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Just two points. I think on the expansion of the Medicare coverage, while it is specific to the age groups of 55 to 64, there is not anyone who is 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 who is not thinking about, my gosh, if I get ill or if something happens to my family am I going to be wiped out by illness. These are people who are near that period of time.

So there are a lot of people who are immediately facing the circumstance, but there are those who are fairly soon going to face the circumstance and they are scared. They are scared. And this seems like an equitable way, with the purpose of not draining Medicare funds, which no one wants to do, we want to make sure those funds are safe, and, at the same time, allowing people the opportunity to pay in. It is not getting something for nothing. We will pay in. In this way we are in some way protected.

I think we have some very, very important health care issues that are critical in the lives of our families today, which is exciting to me and I think to my colleagues. We have a real challenge, we do, on the Medicare expansion issue and with the discussion, and we need to build that support. And I think that the support is out there for doing this, particularly in the country, but we have to build the support here.

But there is, on the managed care side, a great deal of bipartisan support

here. I think we have a perfect opportunity very quickly in this session of Congress to take advantage of that support and the external pressure to get something done in this area.

And what it says ultimately, it says to middle class families in this country, we are there to help you. We are there for people in the country to say you need to have health care coverage, we want to make sure that you have it. We also want to keep the cost contained, but we can do that without somehow putting your health in jeopardy.

And at the same time, a very, very important message to the insurance companies and to the providers; that, in fact, we are willing, we are willing and we are going to stand up to set limits on what they can do and what they cannot do when it regards the health and the safety of Americans in this country.

□ 1530

That needs to be what our obligation is. And the faster we get to it in this session of the Congress, the faster we are going to make Americans believe that what we do here in Washington is not focus on the problems we have here, but we are focusing on the problems that they have in their lives. That is what our obligation is. That is why we were elected to serve.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I think she is right on point.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is so right that this is not an issue that people think about when they are 62. All of us down the line are thinking about it right now, and so many millions and millions of Americans are thinking about health care. It goes back to what I said when I opened my remarks, that health care is something that affects all Americans and it is really up there on the lists of concerns of people.

The hearing we attended, if my colleagues remember those three people that were between 62 and 65, they all said that they could not afford to buy health coverage, that they desperately need it but they simply could not afford to buy it. If we could expand the Medicare program and allow them to buy in at a reasonable cost that they could afford, I mean, are we not then doing something meaningful for people's lives?

Again, average Americans, middle-class people who work hard all their lives, play by the rules, something happens and they get a little older and they suddenly find themselves abandoned. So the gentleman from Connecticut is so right.

I think we in Congress have to show that we are listening to our constituents, to the people out there in America, that in Washington, inside the

Beltway, there are all kinds of things that come into play and there is politics and there is rumor mongering and everything else. The American people are not interested in that. The American people are interested in what is Congress, what is the President, what is Government in Washington doing to affect their lives, to help them in their lives.

Again, I can think of nothing more that we can do to help the average American than to expand health care coverage and to make sure that every American has decent, quality health care; and that is what I think we ought to do in this Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my colleagues.

I think that the President sent a very strong message last night on a number of issues, managed care reform, expansion of Medicare to the near elderly. These are common sense ideas that have the support of the American people; and so we are going to pledge, as Democrats in this House, that we are going to fight to make sure that these proposals get enacted. And if we have to drag along the Republican leadership, we will just drag them along.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STATE OF THE REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 105th Congress has been completed and the third year of the conservative revolution has passed. Current Congressional leadership has declared victory and is now debating on how to spend the excess revenues about to flow into the Treasury.

As the legislative year came to a close, the only serious debate was over the extent of the spending increases negotiated into the budget. The more things changed, the more they stayed the same. Control over the Congress is not seriously threatened, and there has been no clear-cut rejection of the 20th century welfare state. But that does not mean that there is no effort to change the direction of the country. It is just that it is not yet in progress.

But many taxpayers throughout the country are demanding change, and today there are more people in Washington expressing a sincere desire to shrink the welfare state than there were when I left 13 years ago. The final word on this has not yet been heard.

In contemplating what needs to be done and why we have not done better, we should consider several philosophic infractions in which Members of Congress participate that encourage a loss of liberty and endanger our national security and the republic while perpetuating the status quo.

Following are some of the flaws or errors in thinking about issues that I

find pervasive throughout the Congress:

Foreign affairs. Although foreign affairs was not on the top of the agenda in the last session, misunderstanding in this area presents one of the greatest threats to the future of America. There is near conformity, uniformity of opinion in the Congress for endorsing the careless use of U.S. force to police the world. Although foreign policy was infrequently debated in the past year and there are no major wars going on or likely to start soon, the danger inherent in foreign entanglements warrants close scrutiny.

The economy, crime, the environment, drugs, currency instability, and many other problems are important. But it is in the area of foreign policy and for interventionism that provokes the greatest threat to our liberties and sovereignty. Whenever there are foreign monsters to slay, regardless of their true threat to us, misplaced patriotic zeal is used to force us to look outward and away from domestic problems and the infractions placed on our personal liberties here at home.

Protecting personal liberties in any society is always more difficult during war. The uniformity of opinion in Congress is enshrined with the common cliches that no one thinks through, like foreign policy is bipartisan; only the President can formulate foreign policy; we must support the troops and, therefore, of course, the war, which is usually illegal and unwise but cannot be challenged; we are the only world's superpower; we must protect our interests like oil. However, it is never admitted, although most know, our policy is designed to promote the military industrial complex and world government.

Most recently, the Congress almost unanimously beat the drums for war, i.e., to kill Hussein; and any consideration of the facts involved elicited charges of anti-patriotism. Yet in the midst of the clamor to send our planes and bombs to Baghdad, cooler heads were found in, of all places, Kuwait.

A Kuwaiti professor, amazingly, was quoted in a proper pro-government Kuwaiti newspaper as saying, "The U.S. frightens us with Saddam to make us buy weapons and sign contracts with American companies," thus ensuring a market for American arms manufacturers and United States' continued military presence in the Middle East.

A Kuwaiti legislator was quoted as saying, "The use of force has ended up strengthening the Iraqi regime rather than weakening it."

Other Kuwaitis have suggested that the U.S. really wants Hussein in power to make sure his weak neighbors fear him and are forced to depend on the United States for survival.

In spite of the reservations and reasons to go slow, the only criticism coming from congressional leaders was that Clinton should do more, quicker, without any serious thought as to the consequences, which would be many.

The fact that of the original 35 allies in the Persian Gulf War only one remains, Great Britain, should make us question our policy in this region. This attitude in Washington should concern all Americans. It makes it too easy for our presidents to start a senseless war without considering dollar costs or threat to liberty here and abroad. Even without a major war, this policy enhances the prestige and the influence of the United Nations.

These days, not even the United States moves without permission from the UN Security Council. In checking with the U.S. Air Force about the history of U-2 flights in Iraq, over Iraq, and in their current schedules, I was firmly told the Air Force was not in charge of these flights, the UN was. The Air Force suggested I call the Defense Department.

There is much to be concerned about with our current approach to foreign policy. It is dangerous because it can lead to a senseless war like Vietnam or small ones with bad results like in Somalia.

Individual freedom is always under attack; and once there is any serious confrontation with a foreign enemy, we are all required to rally around the President, no matter how flawed the policy. Too often, the consequences are unforeseen, like making Hussein stronger and not weaker after the Persian Gulf War.

The role of the military industrial complex cannot be ignored; and since the marching orders come from the United Nations, the industrial complex is more international than ever.

But there is reason to believe the hidden agenda of our foreign policy is less hidden than it had been in the past. In referring to the United States in the international oil company success in the Caspian Sea, a Houston newspaper recently proclaimed, "U.S. views pipelines as a big foreign policy victory."

This referred to the success of major deals made by giant oil companies to build pipelines to carry oil out of the Caspian Sea while also delivering a strong message that, for these projects to be successful and further enhance foreign policy, it will require government subsidies to help pay the bill. Market development of the pipelines would be cheaper but would not satisfy our international government planners.

So we must be prepared to pay, as we already have started to, through our foreign aid appropriations. This promotes on a grand scale a government business partnership that is dangerous to those who love liberty and detest fascism. And yet, most Members of Congress will say little, ask little, and understand little, while joining in the emotional outburst directed towards the local thugs running the Mideastern fiefdoms like Iraq and Libya.

This attitude, as pervasive as it is in Washington, is tempered by the people's instincts for minding our own

business, not wanting Americans to be the policemen of the world, and deep concern for American sovereignty. The result, not too unusual, is for the politicians in Washington to be doing one thing while saying something else at home.

At home, virtually all citizens condemn U.S. troops serving under UN command, and yet the financing and support for expanding the United Nations' and NATO's roles continues as the hysteria mounts on marching on Baghdad or Bosnia or Haiti or wherever our leaders decide the next monster is to be found.

The large majority of House Members claim they want our troops out of Bosnia. Yet the President gets all the funding he wants. The Members of Congress get credit at home for paying lip service to a U.S. policy of less intervention, while the majority continue to support the troops, the President, the military industrial complex, and the special interests who drive our foreign policy, demanding more funding while risking the lives, property, peace, and liberty of American citizens.

Congress casually passes resolution after resolution, many times nearly unanimously, condemning some injustice in the world, and for the most part there is a true injustice, but along with the caveat that threatens some unconstitutional U.S. military interference, financial assistance, or withdrawal of assistance, or sanctions in order to force our will on someone else. And it is all done in the name of promoting the United Nations and one-world government.

Many resolutions on principle are similar to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which became equivalent to a declaration of war and allowed for a massive loss of life in the Vietnam fiasco. Most Members of Congress fail to see the significance of threatening violence against countries like Libya, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia, Iraq, Iran, or Haiti. Yet our credibility suffers since our policies can never satisfy both sides of each regional conflict.

In the Middle East, even with all our announced intentions and military effort to protect Kuwait, our credibility is questioned as most Arabs still see us as pro-Israel, anti-Arab, and motivated by power, oil and money.

America's effort to prevent a million casualties in Rwanda does not anywhere compare to our perennial effort to get Hussein. It is hardly violations of borders or the possession of weapons of mass destruction that motivates us to get Hussein or drive our foreign policy.

We were allies of Iraq when it used poison gas against the Kurds and across the border into Iran. We support the Turks even though they murdered Kurds, but we condemn the Iraqis when they do the same thing.

There are more than 25,000 Soviet nuclear warheads that cannot be accounted for, and all we hear about from the politicians is about Iraq's control of weapons of mass destruction.

Our policy in the Middle East is totally schizophrenic and driven by Arab oil, weapon sales, and Israel. This is especially dangerous because the history of the West's intrusion into the Middle East for a thousand years in establishing the artificial borders that exist today has created a mindset among Islamic fundamentalists that guarantees that friction will persist in this region no matter how many Husseins or Aya-tollahs we kill. That would only make things worse for us.

As much as I fear and detest one-world government, this chaos that we contribute to in the Middle East assures me that there is no smooth sailing for the new world order. Rough seas are ahead for all of us. If the UN's plans for their type of order is successful, it will cost American citizens money and freedom. If significant violence breaks out, it will cost American citizens money, freedom, and lives.

Yes, I fear a biological and even a nuclear accident. But I see our cities at a much greater risk because of our policy than if we were neutral and friends with all factions instead of trying to be a financial and military ally of all factions depending on the circumstances.

□ 1545

The way we usually get dragged into a shooting war is by some unpredictable incident, where innocent Americans are killed after our government placed them in harm's way and the enemy provoked. Then the argument is made that once hostilities break out, debating the policy that created the mess is off limits. Everybody then must agree to support the troops.

But the best way to support our troops and our liberties is to have a policy that avoids unnecessary confrontation. A pro-American constitutional policy of nonintervention would go a long way toward guaranteeing maximum liberty and protection of life and property for all Americans.

American interests around the world could best be served by friendship and trade with all who would be friends, and subsidies to none.

The balanced budget. There is a naive assumption in Washington that the budget is under control and will soon be balanced, while believing perpetual prosperity is here and new programs can now be seriously considered. It reminds me of an old Chinese saying, when words lose their meaning, people lose their liberty.

Even the revolutionaries have claimed victory. One of the staunchest Members recently declared, in the end we achieved a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. Medicare and welfare were reformed, all in three short years, a truly remarkable record on how far we have come.

I can understand a positive spin on events of the last three years by party leaders. That is what party leaders do. But the revolutionary members of the 104th Congress should not be taken in easily or quickly. But Washington has

a strange way of dulling the senses, and no one enjoys peer rejection or lonely fights, where one is depicted as pursuing a fruitless adventure and appearing negative. Capitulating to the status quo is the road of least resistance, and rationalizations are generously offered up.

It has been especially tempting for Members of Congress to accept the projection of higher revenues as a panacea to our budgetary problems. The prevailing attitude in Washington as 1997 came to a close was that the limited government forces had succeeded. The conservative revolution has won, and now it is time to move on and make government work more efficiently.

I am sure some know better, but the real reason for these declarations of budgetary success is for the sole purpose of maintaining power. Minority leaders find themselves frustrated because they know spending has gone up, and the higher tax revenues have helped those in charge.

The Republican Congress and President Clinton benefited, while the Democratic Congressional leaders could only ask why can't more be spent on welfare if the country is doing so well? Fundamental problems like the size of the budget, the deficit, the debt, higher taxes, currency problems and excessive regulations were put on the back burner, if not ignored altogether.

While complacency regarding foreign policy sets the stage for danger overseas, this naive attitude regarding the budget and the deficit is permitting the welfare state to be reenergized and cancel entirely any efforts to reduce the size and scope of government.

Under Reagan, as in the early parts of the Republican control of Congress, some signs of deceleration in the growth of government were seen. But even then, there was no pretense made to shrink the size of government. And, once again, the path of least resistance has been to capitulate and allow government to grow as it has been for decades. Heaven forbid, no one ever again wants to be blamed for closing down nonessential government services. Only cruel and heartless Constitution lists would ever suggest such a politically foolish stunt.

It is not going to happen. 1997 has proven what many have suspected, that reversing or arresting a welfare state cannot occur by majority vote. With apparent wealth abundance in the United States, the reversal assuredly will not come with ease. Once redistribution of wealth is permitted by the democratic vote, destruction of production will occur before the majority will choose to curtail their own benefits.

The end is closer than most realize, considering the optimistic rhetoric coming from Washington, plus the fact the majority of citizens are beneficiaries of the system, and even the producers have grown dependent on government protection, grants, contracts and special subsidies.

Although the session ended on a modestly happy bipartisan note, I suspect

in time 1997 will be looked upon as a sad year, in that the limited government revolution of 1994 was declared lost by adjournment time in November.

That does not mean the fight for liberty is over, but the hope that came by reversing Congressional rule after 40 years has been dampened and a lot more work is necessary for success. The real battle is to win the hearts and minds of Americans outside of Washington to prepare the country for the day when the welfare state ceases to function due to an empty treasury and the dollar, not worth its weight, comes under attack.

Specifics worth pondering: The budget for current fiscal year 1998 calls for expenditures of \$1.69 trillion, or \$89 billion above last year. The 1997 budget was \$22 billion over 1996. The so-called balanced budget bragged about is to occur in the year 2002, with more cuts being made in the year 2001 and a level of spending far above today's. The expenditures in the year 2002 are expected to increase to \$1.9 trillion, over \$200 billion more than this year.

Increased revenues obviously accomplish the job of a theoretically balanced budget, but also these projections do not take into account the huge sums borrowed from Social Security. Even if things go well and as planned, the optimism is based on deception, wishful thinking and a huge raid on the Social Security and other trust funds. In spite of this, the politicians in Washington are eagerly planning on how to spend the coming budgetary surpluses.

All these rosy projections are dependent on economic strength, steady low interest rates, and no supplemental appropriations. Every session of Congress gets supplementals, and if the economy takes a downturn, the higher the appropriation.

The last three years are not much to brag about. Domestic spending has gone up by \$183 billion. In the prior three years, when Democrats controlled the Congress, spending increased by \$155 billion. Tax increases are now inevitably referred to as revenue enhancement and closing of loopholes.

In spite of some wonderful IRS bashing by nearly everyone and positive hearings in exposing the ruthless tactics of the IRS, Congress and the President saw fit to give the IRS a whopping \$729 million increase in its budget, hoping the IRS will become more efficient in their collection procession. Real spending cuts are not seriously considered.

Congress continues to obfuscate by calling token cuts in previously proposed increases as budget cuts. The media and the proponents of big government and welfare obediently demagogue this issue by decrying why the slashes in the budget are inhumane and uncaring.

Without honesty in language and budgeting, true reforms are impossible. In spite of the rhetoric, bold new edu-

cational and medical programs were started, setting the stage for massive new spending in the future. New programs always cost more than originally projected. The block grant approach to reform did not prompt a decrease in spending, and frequently added to it. The principle of whether or not the Federal Government should even be involved in education, medicine, welfare, farming, et cetera, was not seriously considered.

The 1998 budget is the largest ever and represents the biggest increase in the domestic budget in eight years. Those in charge threw in the towel and surrendered all efforts this past year to cut back the size of government. In this fiscal year, many concede the deficit will actually go up, even without a slowing in the economy.

In this year's budget, Medicare and Medicaid increased four to five times the rate of inflation. This is not a complete surprise to the logical skeptics when it comes to fiscal matters, but it is just a little exasperating to hear the positive pronouncements of current leaders who just a few years ago would have been only too eager to point out the shortcomings of deceptive arithmetic.

Power is a corrupting influence, but, for now, at least, a Congressional power shift is not in the making. There are still a lot of recipients that are happily reassured that additional revenues can be found. The new management is welcomed, and it is hoped the new guys on the block can salvage for a while a system that many deep down in their hearts are convinced is not manageable for much longer.

There is a sense of relief the welfare state has received a reprieve. One can almost hear the sigh amplified by hearing of the problems in the Southeast Asia countries with their currency and stock market problems, not realizing it is the U.S. taxpayers and the dollar that will be called upon for the bailout of this financial crisis.

The great danger of all of this is the false sense of economic security Congress feels, that has prompted total abandonment of efforts to actually cut any spending and with plans being laid for spending increases.

The message is this: The politicians will never limit spending, but, eventually, the market will. It has already done so in Thailand, South Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia.

The international currency crisis: Congress lacks concern and understanding of the significance of the Asian currency crisis. Monetary policy has never excited many Members of the Committee on Banking, let alone other members of Congress. A handful of Members do consistently complain to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, but inevitably it is to object to the high interest rates and not enough credit being available to either the poor or the rich beneficiaries of Central Bank credit largesse.

The Southeast Asian currency and economic bailout will exceed \$100 bil-

lion. We will be propping up these currencies by sending American taxpayers' dollars, the same thing we did in Mexico in 1995. Multilateral efforts through the IMF, World Bank and other development banks are used, and in each one the United States is the most generous donor.

IMF bailouts, just as our military foreign intervention, are generally supported by the leadership of both parties. The establishment has firm control in these two areas and who, out of ignorance or neglect, the Congress as a whole provides little resistance. When the stronger currencies, in this case the dollar, props up a weaker currency, it is nothing more than an example of an international transfer of payment that helps our banks and international corporate investors who have financial exposure in the country or currency under attack.

These bailouts will work, to some degree, until the dollar itself comes under attack. Our relatively strong economy and the current perceptions of undue dollar strength allows great leverage in this extremely expensive and risky bailout operation.

The genius of it all is that Federal Reserve credit expansion and its off-budget budgeting permits these funds to be spent without oversight. IMF appropriations are not even counted toward the deficit, and credit expansion is under complete control of the Federal Reserve.

Long-term, the average American citizen suffers through higher interest rates, rising prices, recessions and lower standard of living, but the cause and effect is conveniently hidden from the public and the Congress.

After the Mexican bailout, her citizens lost 50 percent of their purchasing power, a dramatic pay cut. Yet the great danger is that some day we will be forced to pay, possibly with a dollar crisis that will make the Asian currency crisis look small in comparison.

All currency crises are serious and usher in economic and political problems for the country involved, and since no one likes it, blame is generally misplaced.

When the dollar comes under attack, since it is the reserve currency of the world, a much more serious crisis than we are currently witnessing in Asia will occur. Only a universal acceptance of a single worldwide commodity standard of money can prevent these periodic devaluations and disruptions in trade that are so prevalent today.

The day before we adjourned the first session of the 105th Congress, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services held hearings on the Asian currency crisis, but it was more an attempt to reassure the financial community than to sort out the cause and do something about it.

Instead, the dollar was crowned king, and Greenspan promised stability. Our real interest rates, balance of payments, our current account deficit and budgetary deficits were conveniently

ignored, because if they had been looked at seriously, it would have been recognized that the U.S. and the world faces a major financial crisis once the dollar can no longer be used to bail out the world financial system.

Currency issues are serious and a much bigger problem than Congress realizes. Even the Fed has convinced itself it is quite capable of managing our fiat currency and our financial markets through any crisis. The money managers are every bit as powerful as the Congress, which taxes and spends, but the Federal Reserve's actions are much less scrutinized.

But when push comes to shove, the markets always win out. Interest rates are less than one percent in Japan, but have not prompted borrowers to come forth nor bankers to lend. The proposed \$25 billion injection by the Bank of Japan will not solve the problem either. Even central bankers cannot push on a string.

The sad part is that all these shenanigans will cause undue suffering to the innocent who lose their jobs, suffer from price inflation and see their standard of living shrink.

Eventually, everyone though is threatened by the political disruption that can ensue with a currency mishap. Our greatest concern should be for our loss of liberties that so often accompany a currency crisis. Congressional attitude toward monetary policy is not likely to change soon, so we can expect a lot more turmoil in the currency markets in the months ahead.

□ 1600

Two special areas. Congress in the past year capitulated in two significant areas by not only failing to cut spending, but massively increasing government's role in medicine and in education. House Republicans bragged that 7 out of 8 educational initiatives passed the House, many of them being quite expensive. Charter schools cost over \$100 million, funding for vouchers was increased, \$3 billion was appropriated to extend student loans, and a new \$210 million reading in excellence program was initiated. A program for high-tech training and one designed to help children with disabilities was also started.

Clinton's new health care program for children was accepted by Congress, which will eventually cost billions and further centralize medical care in Washington, while quality of care is diminished. Billions of dollars increased in NIH, AIDS research and preventative health care were also approved.

The Federal Government has been involved in education and medicine more than in any other domestic area. This has caused a serious price inflection for these two services, while undermining the quality and results in both. The more we spend, the higher the cost, the worse the service, and the greater the regulations. So what did Congress do to solve the problems in the past year? Even in this so-called age of cutting

back and a balanced budget, it expanded government precisely in the two areas that suffer the most from big government.

This is strong evidence that we have not yet learned anything in the past 50 years, and the 1994 revolution has not yet changed things. We can expect more HMO's and PPO mismanagement, rationing medical service and price control of all medical services. Shortages of quality health care and education will result.

Devolution. Block grants are the popular vehicle to restore local control of the Federal bureaucracy. The housing bill, the first major change to public housing since the Depression, did not cut spending, but actually increased funding through the block grant system of devolving power to the States. A token effort similar to this was made in the early 1970s under Nixon called revenue-sharing. It did not work and was dropped.

This new method will not work either. Whether the bureaucrats are in Washington or in the State capitols, it will not change the dynamics of public housing. Public ownership, whether managed locally or federally, cannot replace the benefits of private ownership. Besides, the block grant method of allocating funds does not eliminate the need to first collect the revenues nationally and politically distribute the funds to the various State entities. Strings will always be attached no matter how many safeguards are written into the law. The process of devolution is an adjustment in management and does not deal with the philosophic question of whether or not the Federal Government or even the State governments ought to be involved. The high hopes that this process will alter the course of the welfare state will, I am sure, be dashed after many more years of failures and dollars spent.

There is essentially no serious consideration in Washington for abolishing agencies, let alone whole departments. If the funding for the pornographic NEA cannot be cut, which agency of government should we expect to be? The devolution approach is not the proponents of big government's first choice, but it is acceptable to them. Early adjournment meant the call for more spending was satisfied and the supporters of big government, in spite of the rhetoric, were content. Searching for a partisan issue, the minority was content with campaign reform and the questions surrounding illegal voting.

Devolution is said to be a return to States rights since it is inferred that management of the program will be decentralized. This is a new 1990s definition of the original concept of States rights and will prove not to be an adequate substitute.

At the same time these token efforts were made in welfare, education and human resources reform, Congress gave the Federal Government massive new influence over adoption and juvenile

crime, education and medicine. Block grants to States for specific purposes after collecting the revenues at the Federal level is foreign to the concept that once was understood as States rights. This process, even if temporarily beneficial, will do nothing to challenge the underlying principle and shortcomings of the welfare State.

Real battles. The real battles in the Congress are more often over power and personalities than philosophy. Both sides of most debates represent only a variation of some interventionist program. Moral and constitutional challenges are made when convenient and never follow a consistent pattern. These, along with the States rights arguments, are not infrequently just excuses used to justify opposing or approving a program supported for some entirely different reason. The person who makes any effort at consistency is said to be extreme or unyielding.

After giving a short speech criticizing the inconsistency of our foreign policy, another Member quickly rose to his feet and used the Walter Emerson quote to criticize my efforts saying, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines." Criticizing another Member for following a consistent freedom philosophy and strict adherence to the Constitution is more of an attempt to reassure the critics themselves who are uneasy with their own position. Obviously, criticizing one for consistency either means that pragmatism and inconsistency is something to be proud of, or there is little respect for the philosophy that is consistently being defended, a truth the critics are not likely to admit.

Public relation debates. Oftentimes the big debates in Congress are more public relation efforts than debates on real issues. This is certainly true when it comes to preventing foreign aid funds from being used by any organization for abortions. I agree with and vote for all attempts to curtail the use of U.S. taxpayers' funds for abortion within or outside the United States. But many in the pro-life movement are not interested in just denying all birth control, population control and abortion money to everyone, and avoid the very controversial effort to impose our will on other nations. Believing money allocated to any organization or country is not fungible is naive, to say the least. The biggest problem is that many who are sincerely right to life and believe the Mexico City language restriction on foreign aid will work are also philosophic believers in internationalism, both social and military.

The politics of it has allowed temporary withholding of IMF and U.N. funds in order to pressure the President into accepting the restrictive abortion language. Withholding these funds from the United Nations and the IMF in this case has nothing to do with the criticism of the philosophy behind the United Nations, the IMF, the World

Bank, and why the international government agencies are tax burdens on the American people.

It is conceded by the majority on both sides of this debate that the U.N., the IMF, the development banks and even the funds for population control are legitimate expenditures and eventually will be funded. The question is only whether or not a public relations victory can be achieved by the radical pro-abortion supporters of the President's or the pro-life supporters.

We have at least started to debate the merits of any money at all going to population control, the United Nations or the IMF. This is where the debate should be. Even though the restrictions that the Mexico City language might place on foreign expenditures probably will not change the number of abortions around the world, the vote itself does reflect, through Congress, the sentiment of the American people, and therefore, its importance cannot be denied. But I am convinced that if the American people had the option of whether or not to send any money at all, they would reject all the funding, making the restriction debate moot.

Most would agree with the fungibility argument, even when funds are sent for reasons other than family planning and abortion like military assistance. The amazing thing is how important the debate can appear by threatening to withhold greatly sought after IMF funds for an argument that does not get to the heart of the issue. What should be debated is whether or not Congress has the moral and Constitutional authority to use force to take funds from American citizens for social engineering around the world, much of which results in resentment toward America.

The weak and ineffective conditions placed on foreign aid money to prevent abortions is hardly a legitimate reason for continuing the illegal funding in the first place. At times, in efforts to get more swing votes to endorse Mexico City language, some pro-life forces not only will not challenge the principle of our funding for birth control and population control overseas, but believe in increasing the appropriation for the program. If the Constitutionists cannot change the nature of the debate, we will never win these arguments.

Corporatism. Congress and the administration is greatly influenced by corporate America. We truly have a system of corporatism that if not checked will evolve into a much more threatening form of fascism. Our welfare system provides benefits for the welfare poor and, in return, the recipients vote to perpetuate the entire system. Both parties are quite willing to continue the status quo in not questioning the authority upon which these programs are justified, but the general public is unaware of how powerful corporate America is in changing and influencing legislation. Even those programs said to be specific for the poor,

like food stamps, housing, education and medicine, have corporate beneficiaries. These benefits to corporate America are magnified when it is realized that many of the welfare redistributionist programs are so often not successful in helping the poor.

But there are many other programs precisely designed to satisfy the special interests of big business. A casual observer that might think the political party that champions the needs of the poor would not be getting political and financial support from the rich. But quite clearly, both parties are very willing to receive financial and political support from special interests representing the rich and the poor, business and labor, domestic and foreign.

We should not expect campaign reform are reliable revelations of campaign fund-raising abuse in today's political climate. There are strong bipartisan reasons to keep the debate on only a superficial level. All the rules in the world will never eliminate the motivation or the ability of the powerful special interests to influence Congress. Loopholes and illegal contributions will plague us for as long as Congress continues with the power to regulate, tax, or detax, or punishes essentially everyone participating in the economy.

The most we can ever hope for is to demand full disclosure. Then, if influence is bought, at least it would be in the open. The other most difficult task, and the only thing that will ever dampen special interest control of government, would be to radically reduce the power of Congress over our lives and our economy. Taxpayer funding of campaigns would prove disastrous.

The special areas of the budget that are of specific benefit to corporate America are literally too numerous to count, but there are some special programs benefiting corporations that usually prompt unconditional support from both parties. The military industrial complex is clearly recognized for its influence in Washington. This same group has a vested interest in our foreign policy that encourages policing the world, Nation building, and foreign social engineering. Big contracts are given to friendly corporations in places like Haiti, Bosnia and the Persian Gulf region. Corporations benefiting from these programs are unable to deal objectively with foreign policy issues, and it is not unusual for these same corporate leaders to lobby for troop deployments in worldwide military intervention. The U.S. remains the world's top arms manufacturer and our foreign policy permits the exports to world customers subsidized through the Export-Import Bank. Foreign aid, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Export-Import Bank, IMF, World Bank, development banks are all used to continue bailouts of Third World countries heavily invested in by our corporations and banks. Corporations can get special tax treatment that only the powerful and influential can achieve. For instance, pseudo-free trade legislation

like NAFTA and GATT and the recent Fast Track legislation shows how much big business influences both congressional leaders and the administration.

While crumbs are cast to the poor with programs that promote permanent dependency and impoverishment, the big bucks go to the corporations and the banking elites. The poor welcome the crumbs, not realizing how much long-term harm the programs do as they obediently continue to vote for a corporate-biased welfare state where the rich get richer and the poor get forgotten. Since generally both parties support a different version of interventionism, one should not expect the programs for the rich to be attacked on principle or cut in size. The result of last year's legislative session should surprise no one.

Both types of welfare expenditures benefit from a monetary system that creates credit out of thin air in order to monetize congressional deficits when needed and manipulate interest rates downward to nonmarket levels to serve the interests of big borrowers and lenders. Federal Reserve policy is an essential element in serving the powerful special interests. Monetary mischief of this type will not likely be ended by congressional action, but will be eventually stopped by market forces, just as has recently occurred in the Far East.

Voluntary contracts. There is little understanding or desire in Congress to consistently protect voluntary contract. Many of our programs to improve race relations have come from government interference in the voluntary economic contract. Government's role in a free society should be to enforce contracts, yet too often it does the opposite. All labor laws, affirmative action programs and consumer protection laws are based on the unconstitutional authority of government to regulate voluntary economic contracts. If the same process were applied to the press, it would be correctly condemned as prior restraint and ruled unconstitutional.

Throughout the 20th century, economic and personal liberties have undergone a systematic separation. Rules applying to the media and personal relationships no longer apply to voluntary economic transactions. Some Members of Congress are quite vocal in defending the First Amendment and fight hard to protect freedom of expression by cautioning against any effort at prior restraint. They can speak eloquently on why V chip technology in the hands of the government may lead to bad things, even if proponents are motivated to protect our children from pornography. Likewise, these partial civil libertarians are quite capable of demanding the protection of all adult voluntary sexual activity. They mount respectable challenges to the social authoritarian who never hesitates to use government force to mold society and improve personal moral behavior.

□ 1615

But these same champions of personal liberty do not hesitate at all to use the same government force they readily condemn in social matters to impose their vision of a fair and equitable economic system on all of us.

Thousands of laws and regulations are on the books to assure equality in hiring, pay, and numerous other conditions of employment and for theoretical consumer protection.

Ironically, the enemies of the voluntary contract, when dealing with the media and personal associations, are the best defenders of economic liberty and the voluntary economic contract.

Unless this glaring inconsistency is reconciled, the republic cannot be salvaged. Too often, the two sides compromise in the wrong direction. Economic libertarians concede too much to the welfare proponents and the social libertarians concede too much to the authoritarians who eagerly try to legislate good behavior. This willingness to compromise, while at the same time criticizing those who have firm beliefs as being overly rigid, serves as a serious threat to the cause of liberty.

A consistent defense of all voluntary associations does not preclude laws against violence, fraud, threat, libel and slander. To punish acts of aggression and protect non-violent economic and social associations is the main purpose of government in a constitutional republic. Moral imperfections cannot be eliminated by government force any more than economic inequalities can be eliminated through welfare or social legislation.

Once government loses sight of its true purpose of protecting liberty and embarks on a course where the generous use of force is used to interfere in the voluntary social and economic contracts, liberty will be diminished and the foundation of a true republic undermined.

That is where we are today. The effort on both sides to do "good" threatens personal liberty. There is no evidence that laws designed to improve personal sexual habits, the quality of the press or the plight of the poor have helped. The poor, under all programs of forced redistribution of wealth, always become more numerous. And the State inevitably abuses its power when it tries to regulate freedom of expression or improve personal behavior.

Too often both sides allow the principle of government force to be used to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations at a great cost and risk to American taxpayers, while accomplishing little except to promote a firm hatred of America for the interference. This itself is a threat to our security. The resulting conditions of international conflict are used as an excuse to curtail the civil liberties of all Americans.

In recent years, freedom of the press has been severely challenged when we are actively involved in military operations. Our young people are threat-

ened as they are needlessly exposed to enemy fire and medical experimentation and there is an economic cost through higher taxes.

National sovereignty designed to protect liberty in a republic is challenged as our foreign operations are controlled by U.N. resolutions, not Congress. Under these conditions, our cities are more likely to be targeted by terrorists for the hatred our policies fuel. Draft registration remains in place just in case more bodies are needed for our standing U.N. armies. The draft remains the ultimate attack on volunteerism and represents the most direct affront to individual liberty. This is made that much worse when one realizes that it is highly unlikely that we will ever see American troops in action under anything other than a U.N.-sponsored war or military operation.

Only with a greater understanding and respect for individual liberty and the importance of voluntary associations in all areas of social and economic life will we be able to preserve our liberty, peace and prosperity. This is required for the republic to survive.

Congress reflects the nation's current obsession with political correctness. The strange irony is that this whole movement has been encouraged by groups and individuals who in the past have been seen as the champions of free expression and civil liberties. These efforts to interfere with freedom of expression come from a desire to punish those in economic superior positions. Political correctness encourages promotions or firings for casual and rude statements once ridiculed by merely ignoring them. The age of victimization demands political correctness be carried to an illogical conclusion and the plan for perfect economic equality demands language that reflect these goals. It's truly an area that reflects a complete lack of understanding of the principles of liberty and is an understandable result of this century's division of liberty into two parts. The motive seems to be to make people better by forcing them to use only correct language and to provide special benefits to groups that are economically disadvantaged. It's not uncommon to hear of people losing their jobs and reputation over harmless comments or telling off-colored jokes. Talk about discrimination, this is the worst.

The concept of "hate crimes" is now enmeshed in all legislation. Pretending we can measure motivation and punish it is preposterous. Varying penalties, thus placing more value on one life than another, is a totalitarian idea.

The political correctness movement and the concept of hate crimes will lead to laws against "hate speech." Clearly the constitution is designed to protect protesters, even those who express hatred at times and is not limited to the protection of non-controversial speech. Freedom of expression is indeed under serious attack in this country. Already there are laws in two countries prohibiting even questioning the details of the Holocaust. In America that's certainly not permitted under the rules of political correctness.

Some still believe that "hate crimes" in America are limited to identifying the racial and religious motivation behind a violent crime. But it's scary when one realizes that al-

ready we have moved quickly down the path of totalitarianism. In 1995, 57% of all hate crimes reported were verbal in nature. These crimes now being prosecuted by an all powerful federal police force, at one time were considered nothing more than comments made by rude people. The federal police operation is headed up by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education and can reach every nook and cranny of our entire education system as it imposes its will and curriculum on teachers and students.

Whatever happened to the child's logic of "sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me?" This basic philosophy offered a logical response to taunts by bullies. Today, the bully is the government which is determined to regulate, enforce, and imprison anyone who doesn't tow the line of political correctness, multi-culturalism and follow government dictated social and economic rules.

But why can't we consider a solution that incorporates the healthy skepticism of those opposing government mandated V-chips and telephone monitoring devices with those who see the foolishness and danger of political correctness, especially seen when it comes to enforcing crimes against hate speech. Too often the same people who understand the hate crimes issue are the ones that believe government ought to be able to monitor our telephone and computer and censor television programming.

This confusion is becoming structural and the longer it's an accepted principle, the greater the threat to the Republic and our liberties.

As long as it is fashionable or humorous to refer to one who consistently defends individual liberty as a "hobgoblin of little minds" our liberties will be threatened. Accepting and rationalizing any inconsistency while rejecting the principal defenders of a free society as impractical represents a danger to the republic. A strict adherence to the Constitution is surely not something that should be encouraged or tolerated, according to these critics.

By insisting that all government action be guided by tolerance and compromise in any effort to protect liberty, it is only natural that strict observance to standards in other areas would be abandoned. And it is true, we now live in an age where life has relative value, money has no definition, marriage is undefinable, moral values are taught as relative ethics in our classrooms, good grades in the classroom no longer reflect excellence, success in business is often subjected to doubts because of affirmative action, and corporate profits depend more on good lobbyists in Washington than creative effort.

Pragmatism and interventionism are popular because of their convenience and appeal to those who crave governing over others and those who expect unearned benefits. This process can last a long time when some incentives to produce remain in place. But eventually it leads to an attack on the value of money confiscatory taxation, over regulation, excessive borrowing on the future and undermining of trust in the political process. Once this system

is entrenched, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to gracefully reverse the process.

The usual result is the various groups receiving benefits become highly competitive and bitter toward each other. Eventually, it leads to a time when compromise and government planning no longer look practical nor fair. In the next few years, we can expect this to become more evident as Congress will be forced to acknowledge that the budget has more problems than was admitted to in the closing days of the first session of the 105th Congress.

If we do not define the type of government we are striving for and reject interventionism as a doctrine, the endless debate will remain buried in details of form and degree of the current system with no discussion of substance. Merely deciding where to draw the line on government involvement in our lives will consume all the energy of the legislative process. Whether or not we should be involved at all will receive little attention.

In order to direct our efforts toward preservation of liberty, in lieu of planning the economy and regulating people, we must have a clear understanding of rights. But could British Prime Minister Tony Blair be telling us being about Western Civilization and government's responsibility to the people? Blair was quoted in a recent visit with the President as saying, "I tell you, a decent society is not based on rights, it is based on duty. Our duty to one another. To all should be given opportunity, from all responsibility demanded."

This sounds just a tad authoritarian and closer to the Communist Manifesto than to the Magna Carta or to the Bill of Rights.

A free society is just the opposite. I argue that a free society is the only "decent" society and the only one that I care to live in. A free society depends entirely on personal rights for which all individuals are naturally entitled. This was the bedrock of the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution and the principle upon which our republic rests.

Yet today most of the West, now engulfed by Keynesian welfarism, sadly accepts the Blair philosophy. Duty and responsibility, as Blair sees it, is not the voluntary responsibility found in a free society but rather duty and responsibility to the State. He is right about one thing. If duty to the State is accepted as an uncontested fact, rights are meaningless. And everyday our rights are indeed becoming more threatened.

We have come to accept it as immoral and selfish to demand individual rights. Today, rights are too frequently accepted as being collective, such as minority, gay, women, handicapped, poor, or student rights. But rights are only individual. Everyone has a right to life, liberty and property, and it comes naturally or is a God-given gift.

The purpose of the State is to protect equally everyone's rights. The whole purpose of political action should be to protect liberty. Free individuals then with a sense of responsibility and compassion must then strive for moral excellence and economic betterment. When government loses sight of the importance of rights and assumes the responsibility reserved to free individuals and sets about to make the economy equally fair to everyone and improve personal nonviolent behavior, the effort can only be made at the expense of liberty with the efforts ending in failure.

National governments should exist to protect individual liberty at home by enforcing laws against violence and fraud and from outside threats. The bigger and more international government becomes, the more likely it is that the effort will fail.

The original challenge to the champions of freedom centuries ago was always to limit the powers of the king. Today the challenge, every bit as great but harder to define, is to limit the power of democratic parliaments and congresses. Democratic elections of leaders is one thing, but obsession with determining all rights by majority vote has now become liberty's greatest enemy.

Throughout this century, and as the movement grows for one world government, the linchpin is always democracy, not liberty or a constitutionally restrained republic as our Founders preferred. As long as the democratic vote can modify rights, the politicians will be on the receiving end of bribes and money and will be the greatest influence on legislation.

When government's sole purpose is to protect the lowliest of the minority, the individual, there will be no market for influence buying. Regulating the peddlers of graft will only make things worse for the rules will further undermine the right of the individual to petition and seek his own redress of grievances.

Detailed rules on political donations and lobbyist activity can easily be circumvented by the avaricious. Only a better understanding of rights and the proper role of government will alter the course upon which we have embarked.

Political leaders no longer see their responsibility to protect life and liberty as a sacred trust and a concept of individual rights has been significantly undermined throughout the 20th century. The record verifies this. Authoritarian governments, in this the bloodiest of all centuries, have annihilated over 100 million people, their own. Wars have killed an additional 34 million, and only a small number of these were truly in the defense of liberty.

The main motivation behind these mass murders was to maintain political power. Liberty in many ways has become the forgotten cause of the 20th century. Even the mildest mannered welfarist depends on government guns

and threats of prison to forcefully extract wealth from producers to transfer it to the politically well-connected. The same government force is used by the powerful rich to promote from the programs designed to benefit them.

The budgetary process and the transfer of wealth that occurs through monetary inflation is influenced more by the business and banking elite than by the poor. The \$1.7 trillion budget is not an investment in liberty. The kings are gone and I doubt that we will see another Stalin, Hitler, Pol Pot or Mao, but the "majority" in our legislative bodies now reign supreme with one goal in mind: maintaining power.

To do this they must satisfy the power brokers, pretending they are humanitarian saviors while ignoring their responsibility to protect individual liberty.

"Democracy" is now the goal of all those who profess progress and peace, but instead they promote corporatism, inflationism, and world government.

The question is, where will our alternative come from? Which group or individual truly speaks for liberty and limited government? The speeches, the rhetoric, the campaigns rarely reveal the underlying support most politicians have for expanding the State, especially when coming from those who are thought to be promoting limited government.

Those who believe in welfare and socialism are frequently more straightforward. But we are now hearing from some traditional "opponents" of big government, admonishing us to stop "trashing" government. Instead, we should be busy "fixing it." They do it without once challenging the moral principle that justifies all government intervention in our personal lives and economic transactions.

William J. Bennett strongly condemns critics of big government saying, "... some of today's antigovernment rhetoric is contemptuous of history and not intellectually serious. If you listen to it, you come away with the impression that government has never done anything well. In fact, government has done some very difficult things quite well. Like ... reduced the number of elderly in poverty ... passed civil rights legislation ... insure bank deposits and insure the air and water remains clean."

Bennett's great concern is this. "Disdain of representative government (democracy) however, makes it virtually impossible to instill in citizens a noble love of country" (the State rather than liberty). Bennett complains that Americans no longer love their country because of their "utter contempt some have directed against government itself." In other words, we must love our government ruled by the tyrannical majority at all costs or it is impossible to love freedom and America.

Any effort to limit the size of government while never challenging the moral principle upon which all government force depends, while blindly defending majoritarian rule for making

government work, will not restore the American republic. Instead, this approach gives credibility to the authoritarians and undermines the limited government movement by ignoring the basic principles of liberty. Only a restoration of a full understanding of individual rights and the purpose of a constitutional republic can reverse this trend. Our republic is indeed threatened.

REPORT CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS THREATS TO DISRUPT MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-182)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12947, "Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten to Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process" (the "Order") (60 Fed. Reg. 5079, January 25, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in an Annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the

Order (collectively "Specifically Designated Terrorists" or "SDTs").

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition includes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or her delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

Because terrorist activities continue to threaten the Middle East peace process and vital interests of the United States in the Middle East, on January 21, 1998, I continued for another year the national emergency declared on January 23, 1995, and the measures that took effect on January 24, 1995, to deal with that emergency. This action was taken in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)).

2. On January 25, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 Fed. Reg. 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identified 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition, the notice provided 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The list identifies blocked persons who have been found to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process or to have assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence, or are owned or controlled by, or act for or on behalf of other blocked persons. The Department of the Treasury issued three additional notices adding the names of three individuals, as well as their pseudonyms, to the List of SDTs (60 Fed. Reg. 41152, August 11, 1995; 60 Fed. Reg. 44932, August 29, 1995; and 60 Fed. Reg. 58435, November 27, 1995).

3. On February 2, 1996, OFAC issued the Terrorism Sanctions Regulations (the "TSRs" or the "Regulations") (61

Fed. Reg. 3805, February 2, 1996). The TSRs implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against certain persons whose acts of violence have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process. There has been one amendment to the TSRs, 31 C.F.R. Part 595 administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury, since my report of August 5, 1997. The Regulations were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, recordkeeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the Regulations to a separate part (31 C.F.R. Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters (62 Fed. Reg. 45098, August 25, 1997). A copy of the amendment is attached.

4. Since January 25, 1995, OFAC has issued three licenses pursuant to the Regulations. These licenses authorize payment of legal expenses of individuals and the disbursement of funds for normal expenditures for the maintenance of family members of individuals designated pursuant to Executive Order 12947, and for secure storage of tangible assets of Specially Designated Terrorists.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from July 22, 1997, through January 22, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East peace process are estimated at approximately \$165,000. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

6. Executive Order 12947 provides this Administration with a tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The Order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations and individuals to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

Executive Order 12947 demonstrates the United States determination to confront and combat those who would seek to destroy the Middle East peace process, and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1998.

□ 1630

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-183)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Republic of Kazakhstan Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views, is also enclosed.

The proposed agreement with the Republic of Kazakhstan has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and as otherwise amended. In my judgment, the proposed agreement meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States. The agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and Kazakhstan under appropriate conditions and controls reflecting our common commitment to nuclear nonproliferation goals.

Kazakhstan is a nonnuclear weapons state party to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Kazakhstan agreed to the removal of all nuclear weapons from its territory. It has a full-scope safeguards agreement in force with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to implement its safeguards obligations under the NPT. It has enacted national legislation to control the use and export of nuclear and dual-use materials and technology.

The proposed agreement with the Republic of Kazakhstan permits the

transfer of technology, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It provides for U.S. consent rights to retransfer, enrichment, and reprocessing as required by U.S. law. It does not permit transfers of any sensitive nuclear technology, restricted data, or sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components thereof. In the event of termination, key conditions and controls continue with respect to material and equipment subject to the agreement.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 28, 1998.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SWISS FEDERAL COUNCIL CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-184)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying agreed minute, annexes, and other attachments. I am also pleased to transmit my written ap-

proval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and other attachments, including the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also enclosed.

The proposed new agreement with Switzerland has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA) and as otherwise amended. It replaces an earlier agreement with Switzerland signed December 30, 1965, which expired by its terms August 8, 1996. The proposed new agreement will provide an updated, comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and Switzerland, will facilitate such cooperation, and will establish strengthened nonproliferation conditions and controls including all those required by the NNPA. The new agreement provides for the transfer of moderator material, nuclear material, and equipment for both nuclear research and nuclear power purposes. It does not provide for transfers under the agreement of any sensitive nuclear technology (SNT). (U.S. law permits SNT to be transferred outside the coverage of an agreement for cooperation provided that certain other conditions are satisfied. However, the Administration has no plans to transfer SNT to Switzerland outside the agreement.)

The proposed agreement has an initial term of 30 years, and will continue in force indefinitely thereafter in increments of 5 years each until terminated in accordance with its provisions. In the event of termination, key nonproliferation conditions and controls, including guarantees of safeguards, peaceful use and adequate physical protection, and the U.S. right to approve retransfers to third parties, will remain effective with respect to transferred moderator materials, nuclear materials, and equipment, as well as nuclear material produced through their use. The agreement also establishes procedures for determining the survival of additional controls.

Switzerland has strong nonproliferation credentials. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of full-scope IAEA safeguards within its territory. In negotiating the proposed agreement, the United States and Switzerland took special care to elaborate a preamble setting forth in specific detail the broad commonality of our shared nonproliferation commitments and goals.

The proposed new agreement provides for very stringent controls over

certain fuel cycle activities, including enrichment, reprocessing, and alteration in form or content and storage of plutonium and other sensitive nuclear materials. The United States and Switzerland have accepted these controls on a reciprocal basis, not as a sign of either Party's distrust of the other, and not for the purpose of interfering with each other's fuel cycle choices, which are for each Party to determine for itself, but rather as a reflection of our common conviction that the provisions in question represent an important norm for peaceful nuclear commerce.

In view of the strong commitment of Switzerland to the international nonproliferation regime, the comprehensive nonproliferation commitments that Switzerland has made, the advanced technological character of the Swiss civil nuclear program, the long history of U.S.-Swiss cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without any risk of proliferation, and the long-standing close and harmonious political relationship between Switzerland and the United States, the proposed new agreement provides to Switzerland advance, long-term U.S. approval for retransfers to specified facilities in the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) of nuclear material subject to the agreement for reprocessing, alteration in form or content, and storage, and for the return to Switzerland of recovered nuclear materials, including plutonium, for use or storage at specified Swiss facilities. The proposed agreement also provides advance, long-term U.S. approval for retransfers from Switzerland of source material, uranium (other than high enriched uranium), moderator material, and equipment to a list of countries and groups of countries acceptable to the United States. Any advance, long-term approval may be suspended or terminated if it ceases to meet the criteria set out in U.S. law, including criteria relating to safeguards and physical protection.

In providing advance, long-term approval for certain nuclear fuel cycle activities, the proposed agreement has features similar to those in several other agreements for cooperation that the United States has entered into subsequent to enactment of the NNPA. These include U.S. agreements with Japan and EURATOM. Among the documents I am transmitting herewith to the Congress is an analysis of the advance, long-term approvals contained in the proposed U.S. agreement with Switzerland. The analysis concludes that the approvals meet all requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

I believe that the proposed agreement for cooperation with Switzerland will make an important contribution to achieving our nonproliferation, trade, and other significant foreign policy goals.

In particular, I am convinced that this agreement will strengthen the international nuclear nonproliferation

regime, support of which is a fundamental objective of U.S. national security and foreign policy, by setting a high standard for rigorous nonproliferation conditions and controls.

Because the agreement contains all the consent rights and guarantees required by current U.S. law, it represents a substantial upgrading of the U.S. controls in the recently-expired 1965 agreement with Switzerland.

I believe that the new agreement will also demonstrate the U.S. intention to be a reliable nuclear trading partner with Switzerland, and thus help ensure the continuation and, I hope, growth of U.S. civil nuclear exports to Switzerland.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of the Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 28, 1998.*

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by bringing America's attention to the name of a young lady. No, it is not a young lady who was an intern in the White House. It is a young lady who is now dead as a result of negligence on the part of our system. Her name is Yanahan Zhao. She is a 16-year-old girl who was killed after bricks fell from a scaffolding at PS-131 in Brooklyn.

I think it is very important that we note that Yanahan Zhao may not be the only student that has been killed in this kind of accident, but certainly this one we know about, it was reported. It has high visibility. Any time a child is killed in New York City, it gets high visibility. A city that often

ignores the conditions under which students and children are laboring from day to day will focus a lot of attention on a child that is killed.

So death was cruel, and our concerns and prayers we offer to the family of Yanahan Zhao. But I think we ought to understand that we should use her as an example of what we do not want to happen again. We do not want anywhere in America a student killed by bricks falling from the scaffolding of a school, or we do not want any one American student killed as a result of a building decaying or fixtures falling or any other matter. We do not want students killed and hurt.

Yanahan Zhao becomes a motto for a school construction initiative that ought to spread all across America. We have to declare a state of emergency and assume that we have a state of emergency with respect to infrastructure, construction and everything related to infrastructure with schools. We have to listen to the General Accounting Office when they say that more than \$100 billion is needed to deal with updating the infrastructure of public schools across the country. We have to listen.

I have a few other examples of some outrageous things that have happened with respect to school construction or the lack of it. At East New York's Transit Technical High School, a wide swath of brick facade broke free from the building and came crashing down to the sidewalk. The only reason no one was injured is that it was Martin Luther King's birthday holiday, and the children were not in school. That is the only reason we did not have massive injuries. This wall, according to the report of the New York Times of January 23rd, this wall weighed 10 tons. The bricks in that wall weighed 10 tons, measuring about 500 square feet. That is the wall that fell from the school. Fortunately school was out and no one was hurt.

According to the same article in the New York Times of January 23rd, the city construction officials had inspected that school and found it safe just 5 days before a wide swath of the brick facade fell. They said that the school, East New York Transit Technical School, had been inspected at least three times in the last 5 months, most recently last Friday. The last inspection was one of nearly 200 that had been conducted by the city's building department at schools throughout the city after debris, variously described as brick or cinder block, tumbled from a construction site atop of a Brooklyn elementary school, cracking the skull of 16-year-old Yanahan Zhao, who later died from that injury.

I think it is important also to note that New York City has, of course, 1,100 schools, 1 million students. You expect things like that to happen, some people say, cynically dismissing the significance of this.

But across the country, having these same accidents, that get less publicity.

At Phoenix, Arizona, at a Phoenix preparatory academy, a large piece of fireproofing material tore away from the metal decking of a second floor computer room, hitting the teacher.

At Blake Elementary School in Lakeland, Florida, a student was struck on the head when loose mortar fell from over a doorway.

A second grade teacher at Washington Elementary School in Spokane, Washington, was hit on the head and is still suffering nightmares after fluorescent lights peeled from the ceiling and crashed in her classroom. The thousand-pound metal fixture smashed onto her desk and across a small rug where students were gathered. Fortunately the students were not injured.

At Grande Hills High School in Los Angeles, California, six students and two teachers were struck by boards that fell from the roof of their building.

And I am sure it goes on and on, and I would like to invite other Members on both sides of the aisle to gather up these statistics, do a survey on what is happening with the buildings in their districts. This is not a pie-in-the-sky proposition that we should spend far more money than has been proposed on school construction.

I want to sing my praises for the State of the Union address. It was a great address. It offered platforms and programs that I certainly agree with. The education initiatives, I think, that were proposed by the President are magnificent. Most of the initiatives are really needed. But I want to argue here today, and the reason I am here so early in the year, I want to make the case that we keep our eye on the core of the problem, that school construction and the infrastructure of schools is central to any effort to improve America's schools.

There are a lot of other things that are proposed in the President's set of initiatives that can happen if you do not have first attention and most attention directed at school construction. You cannot have a reduction of teachers, a reduction of classroom size so that you have fewer students in the classroom, if you do not have the classrooms.

It is wonderful that the President proposes that the Federal Government take the initiative and provide some of the funding to reduce class size, highly desirable objective, and we must all work toward that objective, but it will not be possible in situations where schools are overcrowded and there are no classrooms.

In 1990, in the fall of 1996, in New York City on opening day they did not have room or places for 91,000 students, that with more than a million students. But even in a system with more than a million students, to not be able to give a desk to 91,000 students is still an outrageous situation.

When schools opened in 1997, we were in the midst of an election year, and nobody would let us see the statistics.

We do not know whether the situation improved dramatically between 1996 and 1997, but we do know from observation and from surveys that have been done by my education advisory committee that in my district there are large numbers of overcrowded schools.

There are some schools where the principals insist that they are not overcrowded, but you can begin to knock that assertion down when you ask the second question. The second question is, how many lunch periods do you have? How many shifts for lunch do you have in your school? And when you find out that they start feeding children lunch at 10:00 in the morning, you know they have got a radical overcrowding problem. It is out of hand. You force a child to eat his lunch at 10:00, and you stop having lunch as late as 2:30, you force a child to wait that long, you have a situation where you have overcrowding and you are punishing the children. It is really a form of child abuse to make a child eat lunch at 10:00 in the morning.

So we have a problem, and the problem is not limited to inner-city schools. It may be more acute and more obvious in inner-city schools across the country, but urban schools, suburban schools all need help in dealing with their infrastructure problems.

We need money to build more schools. The President's proposal, the \$5 billion over a 5-year period, is a good one because it at least is better than nothing. It begins the process. But so much more is needed in order for us to generate the more than \$100 billion that the General Accounting Office says we need to deal with school infrastructure.

Now, the President should not be forced to bear the burden of providing all of the funds for school construction. The Federal Government should not be forced to bear the burden of providing all the funds for school construction. Traditionally, this has been left to the States and localities, and some of my friends on the other side of the aisle in particular argue that only the States and localities should be involved in school construction funding.

I think we ought to share the burden, that the Federal Government should provide a stimulus and should get very much involved to more than just \$5 billion over a 5-year period, but the States and localities should do their job, too.

We have across the country many States that are reporting surpluses in their last year's budget, anticipating surpluses at the end of the fiscal year. New York State's fiscal year ends on March, the last day of March. The new fiscal year begins April 1st. They are predicting more than \$2 billion in surplus, money that they have gained through revenue that they did not have to spend. New York City's budget, which begins on July 1st, ends on June 30th, they are projecting more than a billion dollars, too. \$1.2 billion is presently being projected as the surplus in New York City budget.

So I will agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle, Republicans who say that local government ought to be responsible but not totally responsible. I think the President should use the bully pulpit and challenge all of the States and all of the local governments who have surpluses to deal with the infrastructure problem, the crumbling schools and the overcrowded schools. Particularly in New York City, I think that the first use of the surplus should be addressed to the crumbling infrastructure. No more children should die in New York City. If you have a surplus of \$1.2 billion, then certainly part of that ought to be addressed to school construction. The State has \$2 billion. Part of that ought to be addressed to school construction.

I think that we do not want to be guilty of having a civilization which cannot protect its children in school. School is a very important function of every society, and if we cannot protect our children there, what kind of statement are we making about our concern with children?

We know that dramatic situation that we encounter here in Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. schools opened 3 weeks late last fall because of the fact that they had problems with roof repairs. People criticized the judge for ordering the schools to stay closed while the repairs were being conducted. It appears that that judge might have saved somebody's life because Yanahan Zhao was killed at a school where repairs were under way on the roof. And the bricks fell from the roof and struck her and a number of other students, and she was seriously injured and died. So we might have saved some lives by taking the bold step of refusing to let the Washington schools open while the roof repairs were being conducted.

Of course, we had a situation also where once the Washington schools were opened and the roofs were repaired, the children had a problem because the boilers began to break down in the same schools or some other Washington schools. So you have teachers being forced to tell children to wear extra heavy clothes to come to school, and of course I think it is child abuse to make a child sit in a cold room at a school and depend on his extra clothes to keep him or her warm.

So it is a challenge as to how urgent do we feel the situation is. It is a challenge as to how we really feel about children. Every public official makes speeches about our dedication to children. If you have a surplus, Mr. Mayor, if you have a surplus, Mr. Governor, then show us how dedicated you are to children by putting forth an initiative right away to let the Federal Government know that we may need help. After all, we have in New York, I said, 1,100 schools.

□ 1645

Three hundred of 1100 schools have coal burning furnaces. They are still burning coal. Many of them are more than 100 years old.

So we need a massive program, but certainly the Federal Government has a right to expect our city government and our State government to show some initiative and use their surplus in a constructive way for children.

On July 28th, which is of course today, The New York Times article reports that Mayor Giuliani is expected to announce that the city will finish the 1998 fiscal year with a surplus of \$1.2 billion, thanks in large part to a surging Wall Street. It will be the second year in a row of good fortune for the city, which was pummeled by the recession in the early 1990s. The city ended its last fiscal year with \$1.4 billion more than expected.

So we are 2 years in a row where we had a surplus. The second paragraph I want to read from this article says the following: But in contrast to the election year budget that he presented at this time last year, which called for sharply increased spending on education, children's services and other programs, the Mayor is returning to the conservative fiscal stance he took early in his first term when he pushed through some of the largest spending cuts since the city's fiscal crisis of the 1970s.

If children are not important, if schools are not important, if the surplus cannot be utilized for that purpose, than what is more important? Tell me, Mr. Mayor.

We have, again, as I said before, and I have a list right here, 300 schools out of 1100 schools in New York City that are still burning coal in their furnaces. Now, we might have somewhere in America, maybe many places, some efficient coal burning furnaces that do not spew pollutants in the air, but the likelihood that these old boilers are efficient and are not spilling large amounts of pollutants in the air is nil. They are polluting the air.

Is it any wonder that we have a high asthma rate in the same neighborhoods where the coal burning schools are. Where we have the greatest number of coal burning schools we have the highest asthma rates among the youngsters. There is an obvious correlation there, and we are officially guilty of doing things that we would never sanction or allow the private sector to do. We are endangering the health of children in a very concrete dramatic way.

So we had on the agenda on our ballot 3 years ago a State bond issue related to the environment, and in order to pass that bond issue it was clearly stated that part of the money for the environment bond issue would be used to convert the coal burning boilers in New York. It was clearly stated that part of the money would be used to convert some of the coal burning boilers in New York. That was 3 years ago. That was 3 years ago almost. As of right now not a single school with a coal burning furnace has been converted using the money from the bond issue that we passed almost 3 years ago.

The sense of urgency, emergency, is not there. The concern for children is not there. The concern for students and, in the final analysis, the concern for education is not there. We must think in terms of a state of emergency and we must understand that incremental steps will not solve the problem. Incremental steps will not, in time, save this generation of children. Incremental steps are not good enough.

And the President, in proposing the initiative at the Federal level, has taken the first step. I hope we can increase that, but the call on every unit, every level of government must be made with the Federal Government's leadership stimulating that response.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Thank you so much. I come to the floor today because the most dreadful tragedy has occurred in the City of Portland.

Yesterday a policewoman, Officer Colleen Waibel, was shot and killed by a man with an assault weapon. Another police officer was gravely injured by the same man with an assault weapon. These officers were wearing bulletproof vests but the bullets used by that man struck through those bulletproof vests and killed Officer Colleen Waibel.

I am here to say that I am sick and I am tired of the tyranny of violence. I am sick and I am tired of the tyranny of guns. And I am here to say that I am really sick of the NRA.

There are too many guns in the hands of violent, uncaring people, people who hide behind a constitutional amendment that they misinterpret. Why should our great police officers be in jeopardy every time they go out on the street to protect us because there are people out there with guns such as this man had?

It is enough. We have had enough. We are not civilized if we cannot contain civil strife on our streets. I am here to pledge to the people of my district, whose lives are every day threatened by these same guns, that I will do everything in my power to see that assault weapons no longer threaten us all.

We have allowed those who support this unlimited use of guns to threaten, to badger and to coerce us for too long. And I want to say today that, in my belief, every time a person is killed by an assault weapon, every time a police officer is threatened by a gun, an assault weapon, gun or by cop killing bullets, I want to say that I think the NRA has some guilt in that killing.

Once there was a reason for people to arm themselves in order to protect themselves, and generally, then in those days gun ownership was responsible. But times have changed. Now everyone has guns. Kids have guns and criminals have guns and crazies have guns. And every time we try to pass sensible legislation regarding guns, the NRA brings out all its negative power to stop us. Enough.

Our brave men and women in law enforcement are a well ordered militia.

They must be the ones to preserve law and order to keep our streets safe. The Constitution guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those constitutional guarantees were taken away from Officer Waibel. Those were taken away from her.

Enough. No more killing. It is time to get those weapons off the streets. It is time to end the killing for the sake of Officer Waibel and all the other brave law enforcement officers who every day, every day, face these unlimited guns.

Mr. OWENS. I salute the gentlewoman's sense of urgency. I think the message is quite urgent and my appeal is that we stop the business as usual approach in life and death matters. Gun control certainly is a life and death matter far more immediate than school construction.

In the long run we are talking about life and death of children, life and death of our society. I think the President started at the right place when he talked about Social Security and the concern of people and what happens to our Social Security. But I think we also understand that, and I am not one of those who thinks our Social Security is endangered, that we are facing the possible bankruptcy in 30 years, I think that is all propaganda, but the President certainly, by making Social Security the highest priority with the utilization of the surplus, has challenged those people and we can finally deal with it.

If we really need the money, then the surplus should be directed in that direction. But Social Security is threatened if we do not have a work force, a work force that can keep our economy going. And I am going to talk in a few minutes about the work force for the Information Age, the information technology workers and the great crisis that exists right now and is likely to grow even worse.

First, I want to talk about one of the President's initiatives. And again we must get behind the President and push these initiatives with a sense of urgency. There is a great need for the additional 100,000 teachers that he proposed. And whereas he talked mainly about those teachers being utilized to train students to read, I think we ought to seriously consider that we need teachers also who are able to deal with training children and what they need at every step of their educational career to get ready for the world of information technology where the jobs are going to be in the future.

I think we also should understand how this relates back to my concern with construction and infrastructure. If we pull in large numbers of idealistic students and they become teachers, do not subject those teachers to a problem of the boilers breaking down and they have to go into cold classrooms and instruct students who are shivering, or they have to participate in instructing students to wear heavy clothes to go to school in order to stay warm.

Do not subject teachers to a situation where they are teaching about the environment and they are teaching about health care and they are teaching about pollutants and we have coal burning furnaces right there at the school spewing pollutants into the air and children suffering from asthma at a greater rate. Do not subject teachers to that kind of situation.

Do not subject teachers to a request that they teach youngsters and use the latest technology, use the Internet, get them prepared for what is coming in the future of these children and then do not have adequate computers for them. And if they have computers, they are not hooked up to the Internet because the school cannot be wired properly.

They are old schools and the wiring does not lend itself, or they are afraid that asbestos, a problem I encountered in trying to wire 11 schools. And we did on Net Day. Net Day, by the way, is the national day on October 25th where all across the country volunteers were called upon to wire their schools. It was a Saturday. And volunteers came in to wire the schools so they could be hooked up to the Internet.

A school was considered appropriately wired and reaching the Net Day goals if 5 classrooms and the library was wired. So for 11 schools we got five classrooms and the libraries wired. It was not easy. And whereas I endorse the notion of using volunteers, and I know that there have been some very successful Net Days across the country using volunteers, we had to have some professional volunteers.

If you do not have some people who really know a little bit about what they are doing, it can really bog down. So I want to thank the Bell Atlantic crews that came in, because we did have a partnership with the private sector, and the private sector hooked us up with Bell Atlantic crews that came in to help. And there were some other private sector groups that provided us with personnel that went to the schools ahead of time to help mark off the wirings.

It was a beautiful operation bringing together the private sector and the school officials and the local community volunteers, but it was very difficult just to wire 11 of 1100 schools. In other parts of New York City, I understand there were other schools wired on that day, but the number of schools that have been wired to hook up to the Internet is, indeed, a very tiny number for New York City.

In case my colleagues did not know it, effective this Friday the FCC has announced that the universal fund for libraries and schools application process will begin. If you want to apply for the more than \$2 billion available to pay for telecommunication services, if you are qualified, the process of qualification for the funds will begin this Friday, and that process will continue for 75 days.

And they are using the Internet. They are using the Internet as a way of

getting the applications. So for the 75 days you can put your application in. It is a simplified application, with forms. You can do it right on the Internet and send it in.

□ 1700

Anytime within that 75-day period that you put your proposal in, it will be considered like the first day, everybody is equal; and only at the end of the 75 days will the clock be cut off. So I think it is very important to link these things up and understand that here is an advantage that is being made as a result of an act of Congress, Telecommunications Act of 1996, where the Congress instructed the FCC to set up a universal fund for libraries and schools for telecommunications and give them a discount.

The poorest schools get up to a 90-percent discount. Any school in America can get a 20-percent discount. So that only operates if you have computers.

If they have a technology set up where they have computers and somebody who is in charge of their computers in their school and they meet the requirements, only that way will they be able to take advantage of a discount. They cannot have the setup and have their school wired if they do not have an infrastructure already that allows them to do that.

Asbestos is a major problem. When we start marking holes in the walls, boring the holes to put the wires through, we confront an asbestos problem. New York City must have a certified asbestos inspector come out, very expensive, each school have a certified asbestos inspector come out and say what we are doing will not cause a health hazard. Very expensive. So if there are only a tiny number of schools that are wired, my colleagues can understand how that hurdle alone will keep the number down.

When we get into the details, it makes it very sad for inner city schools. They are not wired now, and they are not likely to be wired anytime soon. They will not be able to take advantage of universal telecommunications for the universal funds for libraries and schools for telecommunication if they are not wired. It all goes back to the problem of infrastructure and construction.

So we must assume a state of emergency. Because there is a domino theory operating here. One inadequacy, one critical inadequacy with respect to construction and infrastructure sets off a chain reaction where it generates more disadvantages and more inadequacies.

The President gave a long list of initiatives and education, and I think he must understand and all of us must understand that those initiatives, most of them, will not go forward unless we deal with the basic problem of school infrastructure. Among those initiatives, he mentioned the fact that we want to have our children able to go

into the 21st century with the knowledge that they need to hook up with the burgeoning and growing information industries.

There was a major conference held in California in Berkeley in the second week in January related to the critical shortage of information technology workers. Business is very upset by the fact that they are beginning to feel the pinch of this critical shortage of workers. And I think that it directly relates to the fact that at one point the President talked about an initiative that is needed which is similar to the GI education bill. We need something as massive as that in order to really get ready to confront the changing of our society into an information technology society.

The conference was held on January 12. I just want to read a few excerpts from an article that appeared in the New York Times.

The Clinton administration will announce today a broad and unique Federal effort to help train more computer programmers, responding to concerns from economists and business leaders that U.S. companies have a critical shortage of skilled technology workers.

The administration's initiatives, which include millions of dollars in grants to fund educational programs, the creation of a nationwide job bank on the Internet, and a campaign to glamorize computer-related professions, come as a new survey shows that 1 in every 10 information technology jobs in the United States is unfilled.

The study, conducted for an industry group by Virginia Tech and scheduled to be released today, estimated that 346,000 computer programmer and systems analyst jobs are vacant in U.S. companies with more than 100 employees.

Although rapidly growing computer firms increasingly have had difficulties finding enough workers with cutting-edge skills, the Virginia Tech report indicates that the shortage has spread to many non-technology firms, including banks, hospitals and retailers that depend on programmers to design and operate large systems for their businesses. The widening scope of the issue has prompted the administration to take the unusual step of intervening in a worker training issue.

The Federal Government programs will form the central part of a campaign among industry and educational institutions to chip away at the shortage. The efforts will be unveiled formally at a meeting of government and industry leaders in Berkeley, California, including Commerce Secretary Daley and Education Secretary Riley.

"The shortage is a fundamental threat to the economic growth of the United States," says Harris N. Miller, president of the Information Technology Association of America, an Arlington-based industry group that is organizing the meeting.

"It's not just hurting the ability of classic computer companies to grow. It's hurting the ability of the entire economy to grow through the productivity increases you get if you can install the latest technology products," Miller said.

The Virginia Tech study confirmed similar findings made last year and shows that the industry has made no progress in reducing the shortage of technology workers.

Though many statistical measures indicate the U.S. economy is at one of its strongest points in recent history, the economists say

much of the recent growth has come through technology: both the growth of the Nation's tech industry and cost savings from the use of computers.

"Right now, technology represents 50 percent of the Nation's economic growth," says Kelly H. Carnes, deputy assistant secretary for technology policy at the Commerce Department. "It is the most important enabling industry."

I will not read any further, but my point is that this has a great deal to do with those constituents of mine in the low-income section of my district, the people who cannot find jobs, and some of them, you know, are community college graduates. But many have never been exposed at all to a computer. It is relevant in terms of not so much the astronomical figures that are mentioned today, and they say 346 vacancies now.

The Department of Labor has a more conservative estimate of an additional 1.2 million workers over the next 5 years. If we take the most conservative estimate of the Department of Labor or the estimate given as a result of the Virginia Tech report, we still have a large growing industry which probably nobody can fully estimate what the limits are.

There are jobs there for the future. There are jobs for the youngsters coming out of our schools if they have had some kind of orientation to computers early in their schooling, beginning in the elementary grades, progressing through junior high school and, of course, high school. They really need some significant exposure to the utilization of computers before they get to college. And many of them may never go to college. Many of them may never go to college.

There are some young men that I know who did take a few courses in college and maybe were exposed to college to some degree, but they did not take any computer science courses, and they have decided because they like to work with computers that they will go into this field. They are getting promotions and making very good salaries with a bright, rosy future. One who started at \$35,000 says that by the end of this year, in less than 3 years, he expects to be making \$100,000 a year, and he has never taken a computer science course in a college.

So, in addition to the programmers, in addition to the analysts, we need the troubleshooters, we need the mechanics, we need people all up and down the line. And it cannot happen. The opportunity will be there, and we will not be able to fill that opportunity if our schools do not have the courses and the exposure to computers that are necessary, the opportunity to utilize computers.

Most of the homes in my district do not have computers. Nationwide, computers are a middle-class phenomenon, upper middle-class phenomenon and a large percentage of middle-class people have computers in the home. Most of the children who go to public school in my district will not be exposed to computers except in school and library.

And I want to congratulate the Brooklyn Public Library. In several of the poor areas, they have installed computers. They have only a few. But it does give youngsters an opportunity to come in and practice a little and get some exposure. The Brooklyn Public Library has a very forward-looking approach to computerization and technology. There is a lot of vision that the director of that library has shown in this area.

Recently, the Brooklyn Public Library received some grants from Microsoft to continue their work and to expand it; and we are looking forward to the library, which is a free-standing institution. Not only can the student and school come there, but the parents can come, and the people who are not enrolled in school can also utilize the library's computers. That is an area we hope will continue to grow.

I did say that the universal fund that the FCC has created is for both schools and libraries. It is for private schools as well as public schools, and it is for libraries. So they will have an opportunity to be able to get the discount on the telecommunications services, telephone company, Internet, various telecommunications services. They will qualify also for the discount which ranges between 20 and 90 percent.

And I am not rambling at all, I assure my colleagues. There is a direct connection between the need to have an emergency school construction initiative across the country. There is a need to deal with this as a central problem related to education.

The additional qualified teachers, the efforts of the Federal Government to recruit more teachers, all of those are important and must go forward. But I hope that we understand if you bring teachers in on a system where they see children's lives in jeopardy, and in many cases their own lives are placed in jeopardy, or if you bring them in situations where their lives are not placed in jeopardy directly in some kind of concrete way but they are in a polluted environment that is injuring not only the health of the children but also their health, how long do you think we will keep these qualified teachers?

I think we ought to think in terms of the GI education bill that allowed thousands and thousands of returning GIs to get an education, a broad sweeping approach. This country has done that kind of thing only a few times in its history, but it has been very important.

The GI bill set up a situation where the need for a highly educated work pool, workforce, was met by the people who came out of those programs. We did not really know exactly what they were going to do later. But we have outstanding scientists, outstanding lawyers, politicians. A lot of people came through the GI bill into the schools and never would have gotten an education otherwise. It is a massive program. It was not an incremental program. It was not a nickel-and-dime

program. It was a massive program which was necessary.

We ought to see what we are facing now as the day after Pearl Harbor. There are many, and certainly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insist that there should be no more, big Federal programs, big spending programs.

□ 1715

I agree that government should be reduced, and we are proud of the fact it has been reduced. I agree there is a lot of waste in government. I have said it over and over again, you do not need the CIA spending \$20 billion or more. You can downsize our overseas bases.

There are a number of ways you can save money in government, but do not get locked into an ideological approach, a dogma, that says that no program should be big enough to meet the challenge.

If, on the day after Pearl Harbor was attacked, we came to the conclusion that, yes, there is a need to mobilize the country, there is a need to spend a great deal of money to marshal resources to meet the threat, but somebody said, well, it costs too much, where would we be? It would be absurd for anyone to argue that the mobilization to meet the threat that Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor posed, or Hitler posed operating in concert with Japan, the threat to the world's freedom, the direct threat to our own well-being, nobody would be so absurd as to say you cannot spend the money that is necessary to do it.

The problem is when it comes to educational reform, we really do not believe we are threatened. We really do not believe the very foundations of society can be rocked if we have jobs and opportunities out there available and a large population that needs jobs, and are not qualified and cannot get to those jobs, and the reason that happens is just because we fail to provide adequate opportunities.

We really do not believe that our competitors in other parts of the world can outstrip us, despite all the advantages that we have, we are on top of the economic heap right now; really do not believe that can be threatened if some other nations showing much more vision about educating their population would overtake us in the critical areas of information technology and the kinds of things you can do only with information technology.

Right now you have India. That is not a superpower and never claims to be a superpower, but India is a major source of computer programmers for the United States. Bangalore, India, some people call the computer capital of the world, computer programming capital. Large numbers of American companies are contracting with groups in Bangalore to do their computer work, and large numbers of companies are bringing personnel from there here to work.

Here is a country not nearly with as many advantages and resources that

we have, but they have made a choice educationally which is paying great dividends in terms of being able to employ their work force in a foreign country.

We should not allow the situation to develop where we have to rely on foreign sources for the work force of the future because those foreign centers in the final analysis will take the know-how back to their own countries and increase the competition.

We may be on top of the heap now and consider ourselves invulnerable economically, but that is not the case. Let's declare a state of emergency and start thinking about the things with the greatest sense of urgency, and get away from the incremental approach where everybody in this capital that has some power has some idea of what should be done with education.

The Committee on Appropriations more and more writes education bills, taking the power away from the authorizing committee, because they have the power to do it, not the know-how. Many things proposed in the Committee on Appropriations are not harmful, they will do some good, but the whole idea of a scatter gun approach, that any man with power interested in education is able to impose his will on us because they can get the appropriate bill passed and an amount of money appropriated, that is the wrong approach to education reform.

We need a comprehensive approach where we understand that large amounts of resources are needed, and we must focus on what is most important and set some priorities.

I think the President, some people accused him last night of giving a laundry list not only of education programs, but other programs, I think he understands that laundry list has priorities. He understands some of the connections.

I am confident this President can deliver on his educational agenda, as well as the rest of his agenda. I have had a lot of calls from people asking me and people who are really concerned about the child care initiatives and the education agenda of the President. Those announcements have been going on for the last 10 days, announcements coming from the White House about new programs for child care, tax credits and more money for day care centers.

There are large numbers of people among my constituents that are very interested in the reality of those things, will he be able to deliver, and those questions, of course, have come in the last few days as a result of the problems that have come forward from the White House with respect to the President's personal life.

My answer to the constituents who want to know will we really get the child care initiative program implemented, does he have the ability to go forward and do this, where some people want the training, they finally think that people who want to go into the child care field can get some training

which allows them to qualify for a job which is a decent paying job and be in a position to be promoted, will it really happen? Will we get more money, so day care centers are not just for the very poorest people, but also for some working families that are not on welfare.

All these questions are being asked, and my answer to them is yes, this President can deliver, and he will deliver. I have seen nothing happen at the White House which says that he will not be able to deliver on the agenda which was laid out last night.

I answer some people by saying, look, Thomas Jefferson in his first year in office was confronted with a problem where they were trying to drive him out of office, accusations were made about his private life, and the press of that day had a drum beat going to try to get him out of office. But they did not succeed. Thomas Jefferson refused to even address their criticisms, to address their charges.

Thomas Jefferson kept his focus on what he was doing, and Thomas Jefferson delivered the Louisiana purchase, which doubled the size of the Nation at a very low price. Thomas Jefferson fathered the Lewis and Clark expedition. Thomas Jefferson restored certain liberties that the Federalists had carelessly begun to take away from people. His accomplishments were magnificent, despite the fact he was confronted with a major challenge on the basis of his personal life.

There is no reason to assume that this President cannot deliver because of the present challenges. There is no way to assume that he will not be around or be able to negotiate and to drive his program through to conclusion. I think it is very important to understand that.

I have been here 16 years. I was here when another government was set up in the basement of the White House. People have forgotten Irangate. They have forgotten that in the basement of the White House there was an operation running which was raising money, where money was being raised to fund the Contras in Nicaragua. Not only were they raising money, but they entered into a deal for Iran to buy arms, to let Iran buy arms from us, and use the money raised from that to fund the Contras. That was a government operating out of the basement of the White House, contrary to what Congress had already clearly stated in legislation they should not do.

This Nation survived that, and no President was impeached as a result of that, and that was far more serious than anything I have heard recently. I think it is important that we keep our focus on the things that are important to the American people.

Common sense dictates that the agenda set forth last night ought to be realized. We ought to allow the President the opportunity to deliver that to the American people. I think it can happen. At the heart of it, I think,

should be his educational initiative. At the heart of his educational initiative should be the school construction priority. We are going to hear more about this in the future. I do not intend to let it get lost again.

Last year we had a great start. The President mentioned in the first session of the 105th Congress a school construction initiative. Later on negotiations took place with the White House and the school construction initiative was taken off the table. We must not let that happen again. From start to finish, we must focus on the fact that if you care about children, if you want to improve American education, at the core of the improvement process has to be a massive school construction initiative in this Nation.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1998

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1213. An act to establish a National Ocean Council, a Commission on Ocean Policy, and for other purposes, and in addition, to the Committee(s) on Resources, Science, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. DEGETTE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for January 27 and today, on account of business in the district.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of a family emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLINK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BENTSEN.
Mr. KUCINICH.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. BOYD.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. CONYERS.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. SHERMAN.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. STARK.
Mrs. LOWEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
Mr. SHAYS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WELLER.
Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Ms. WATERS.
Mr. BISHOP.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. TALENT.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. OWENS.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. BENTSEN.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,
FEBRUARY 3, 1998

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 201, 105th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3, 1998, for morning hour debates.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 201, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 3, 1998, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the

United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 105th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable Vito Fossella, Thirteenth District of New York.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. Supplemental report on H.R. 10. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes (REPT. 105-164 PT. 4).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 3116. A bill to address the Year 2000 computer problems with regard to financial institutions, to extend examination parity to the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision and the National Credit Union Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 3117. A bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 3118. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for Hawaii to 59.8 percent; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLUNT:

H.R. 3119. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to the dilution of famous marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3120. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 95 West 100 South Street in Provo, Utah, as the "Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAXON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 3121. A bill to provide for the recovery of insurance issued for victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 3122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 3123. A bill to suspend the duty on niobium oxide until January 1, 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 3124. A bill to suspend the duty on vanadium pentoxide (anhydride) until January 1, 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 3125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3126. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore the non-applicability of private contracts for the provision of Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 3127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the information reporting requirement relating to the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits imposed on educational institutions and certain other trades and businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. YATES, and Mrs. CLAYTON):

H.R. 3128. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to restrictions on changes in benefits under MedicareChoice plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 3129. A bill to establish a program to encourage local educational agencies to work with the private sector to provide care to children who are less than the age of compulsory school attendance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 3130. A bill to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 3131. A bill to make available on the Internet, for purposes of access and retrieval by the public, certain information available through the Congressional Research Service web site; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 3132. A bill to establish food safety research, education, and extension as a priority of the Department of Agriculture, to require the use of a designated team within the Department of Agriculture to enable the Department and other Federal agencies to rapidly respond to food safety emergencies, and to improve food safety through the development and commercialization of food safety technology; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 3133. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans, and to express the sense of the Congress that other countries should establish substantially equivalent restrictions; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEYGAND (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3134. A bill to warn senior citizens of the dangers of telemarketing fraud and to provide them with information that will help them protect themselves; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEYGAND (for himself and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 3135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the dependent care tax credit refundable and to increase the amount of allowable dependent care expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution exploring human rights abuses in Kosovo and calling for increased American involvement; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. YATES (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Res. 342. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr.

DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. STUMP):

H. Res. 343. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the award of attorneys' fee, costs, and sanctions of \$285,864.78 ordered by United States District Judge Royce C. Lamberth on December 18, 1997, should not be paid with taxpayer funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. TRAFICANT introduced A bill (H.R. 3136) to recognize and compensate Boris Korczak for intelligence gathering services rendered during the cold war; which was referred to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 76: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 126: Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 135: Mr. MINGE and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 145: Mr. BOYD, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 164: Mr. FORD and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 371: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 532: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 586: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 598: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 611: Mr. FORD and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 641: Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 715: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 716: Mr. PAXON.
H.R. 758: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 836: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 853: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 857: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 859: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 884: Ms. NORTON and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 922: Mr. QUINN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 923: Mr. QUINN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 981: Mr. FORD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 982: Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 1023: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 1056: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
H.R. 1071: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1117: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YATES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. FURSE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WISE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1126: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1132: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1176: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1191: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1281: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1284: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1334: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1362: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1367: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1375: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. DANNER.
H.R. 1376: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 1390: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1408: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1425: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
H.R. 1450: Mr. HAMILTON.
H.R. 1525: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1539: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1573: Mr. GREEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1584: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1595: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 1656: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1711: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. KIM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SNOWBARGER.
H.R. 1736: Mr. FORD and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1737: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1766: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1951: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1987: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 2009: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2020: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYUN, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2021: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 2023: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2070: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2088: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mrs. NORTHUP.
H.R. 2110: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2125: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2149: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 2173: Mr. HORN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2191: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. PEASE.
H.R. 2374: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MANTON, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2392: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2397: Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 2409: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VENTO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2457: Mr. GREEN.
H.R. 2459: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2495: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 2499: Mr. COOK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr.

McCRERY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENSIGN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2519: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2525: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2537: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2549: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2552: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2586: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 2602: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2625: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 2681: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2704: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2714: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2733: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 2778: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2817: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 2819: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. CLAYBURN.

H.R. 2836: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MINGE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SABO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 2846: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms.

DUNN of Washington, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 2870: Mr. CAMP and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2884: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2888: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 2912: Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 2914: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2921: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2923: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. FURSE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2952: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2990: Ms. CARSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FORD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 2992: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2993: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2997: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3003: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 3010: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3027: Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3028: Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3035: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 3043: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3051: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3086: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3097: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BRADY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.J. Res. 14: Ms. RIVERS.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. JOHN and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. RIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PETRI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LUTHER, and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. RYUN, Mr. FORD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HORN, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Con. Res. 165: Mr. KLINK.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 202: Mr. McKEON, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. McKEON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 70: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H. Res. 151: Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 267: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H. Res. 304: Mr. BALLENGER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2174: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.